

Historic, Archive Document

Do not assume content reflects current scientific knowledge, policies, or practices.

LEGISLATIVE HISTORY

Public Law 219--78th Congress

Chapter 383--1st Session

S. J. Res. 103

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | |
|--|---|
| Digest of Public Law 219 | 1 |
| Index and Summary of History on S. J. Res. 103 . . . | 1 |



DIGEST OF PUBLIC LAW 219

COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION CONTINUATION. Continues the CCC as a U. S. Agency until February 17, 1944.

INDEX AND SUMMARY OF HISTORY ON S. J. RES. 103

Hearings: See H. R. 2725.

| | |
|-------------------|---|
| October 14, 1943 | H. R. 3458 introduced by Rep. Steagall and referred to the House Committee on Banking and Currency. (Similar bill). |
| October 18, 1943 | S. 1458 introduced by Sen. Barkhead and referred to the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency. (Similar bill). |
| December 13, 1943 | S. J. Res. 99 introduced by Sen. Ellender and referred to the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency. (Similar bill). S. J. Res. 100 introduced by Sen. Ellender and referred to the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency. (Similar bill). |
| December 15, 1943 | Senator Taft proposed an amendment to S. 1458. |
| December 16, 1943 | S. J. Res. 103 introduced by Senator Parkeley and referred to the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency. Print of the Resolution as introduced |
| December 17, 1943 | Discussed and passed both Houses. Passed House with amendments. House insists upon its amendments and agrees to Conference. Conferees appointed. |
| December 18, 1943 | Conference Report submitted on S. J. Res. 103. House Report 976. Both Houses agreed to Conference Report. |
| December 23, 1943 | Approved. Public Law 219. |

See also: Public Laws 151 and 240 - 78th Congress.
Miscellaneous Bills: H. R. 2369 (vetoed) and H. R. 3477.

78TH CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

H. R. 3458

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

OCTOBER 14, 1943

Mr. STEAGALL introduced the following bill; which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency

A BILL

To continue the Commodity Credit Corporation as an agency of the United States, to revise the basis of annual appraisal of its assets, and for other purposes.

1 *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representa-*
2 *tives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*
3 That section 1 of the Act approved March 8, 1938 (52 Stat.
4 107), as amended, is hereby amended by deleting from
5 the first sentence thereof the term "31st of March" where
6 that term first appears therein and substituting in lieu
7 thereof the term "30th of June", and by deleting from
8 the second sentence thereof "on the basis of the cost, includ-
9 ing not more than one year of carrying charges, of such
10 assets to the Corporation, or the average market prices of

1 such assets for a period of twelve months ending with March
2 31 of each year, whichever is less” and inserting in lieu
3 thereof “on the basis of the cost, or, insofar as practicable,
4 the average market price of such assets during the last
5 month of the fiscal year covered by the appraisal, which-
6 ever is the lower”. The first appraisal of the assets and
7 liabilities of the Commodity Credit Corporation on the basis
8 established by this amendment shall be made as of June 30,
9 1944.

10 SEC. 2. Section 7 of the Act approved January 31, 1935
11 (49 Stat. 4), as amended, is hereby amended by changing
12 the designation thereof to section 7 (a) ; by striking out in
13 the first sentence thereof “December 31, 1943, or such
14 earlier date as may be fixed by the President by Executive
15 Order,” and inserting in lieu thereof the following: “the
16 expiration of the two-year period beginning with the 1st
17 day of January immediately following the date upon which
18 the President by proclamation or the Congress by concurrent
19 resolution declares that hostilities in the present war have
20 terminated,”; and by striking out the period at the end of
21 such section and inserting in lieu thereof a comma and the
22 following: “without regard to provisions of any other exist-
23 ing law relating to public funds: *Provided, however,* That
24 the Corporation shall at all times maintain complete and

1 accurate books of account and shall determine the procedures
2 to be followed in the transaction of the corporate business.

3 “(b) The financial transactions of the Corporation be-
4 ginning with the period from July 1, 1944, shall be audited
5 by the General Accounting Office in accordance with the
6 principles applicable to commercial corporate transactions
7 and under such rules and regulations as may be prescribed by
8 the Comptroller General of the United States: *Provided*,
9 That the Corporation shall continue to have the authority to
10 make final and conclusive settlement and adjustment of any
11 claims by or against the Corporation or the accounts of its
12 fiscal officers: *Provided further*, That a report of such audit
13 shall be made to the Congress, together with such recom-
14 mendations as the Comptroller General may deem advisable,
15 and that each such report shall cover a period of one fiscal
16 year and shall not be made until the Corporation and the
17 Secretary of Agriculture shall have had a reasonable oppor-
18 tunity, not to exceed ninety days, to examine the report,
19 point out errors therein, explain or answer the same, and
20 file a statement which shall be submitted by the Comptroller
21 General with his report: *Provided further*, That a copy of
22 each such report shall be furnished the Secretary of the
23 Treasury and that the findings contained therein shall be
24 considered by the Secretary in appraising the assets and

1 liabilities and determining the net worth of the Corporation
2 under sections 1 and 2 of the Act of March 8, 1938 (52
3 Stat. 107), as amended: *Provided, however,* That nothing in
4 this section shall be construed as modifying legislation au-
5 thorizing the use of funds of the Corporation for administra-
6 tive expenses and requiring accountability therefor.

7 “(c) The expenses of the audit as provided in this section
8 may be paid up to and including June 30, 1946, from moneys
9 advanced therefor by the Corporation, or from any appro-
10 priation or appropriations for the General Accounting Office,
11 and appropriations so used shall be reimbursed promptly by
12 the Corporation as billed by the Comptroller General: *Pro-*
13 *vided,* That any such advances or reimbursements shall be
14 considered as nonadministrative expenses of the Corporation.
15 For the purpose of such audit the representatives of the
16 General Accounting Office shall have access to all papers,
17 books, files, accounts, financial records, warehouses, and all
18 other things, property and places belonging to or under the
19 control of or used or employed by the Corporation and shall
20 be afforded full facilities for verifying transactions with the
21 balances in depositaries and with fiscal agents: *Provided*
22 *further,* That the certified financial reports and schedules of
23 the fiscal agents of the Corporation based on commercial
24 audits in the usual course of business may be accepted by the
25 General Accounting Office in its audit of the financial trans-

1 actions of the Corporation as final and not subject to further
2 audit verification.

3 “(d) Any examination of the corporate records shall be
4 made at the place or places where such records are normally
5 kept in the transaction of the corporate business, and the
6 Corporation shall retain custody of contracts, vouchers,
7 schedules, or other financial or accounting documents, either
8 original or duplicate, relating to its nonadministrative
9 transactions.”

10 SEC. 3. No funds appropriated to, borrowed by, or in
11 the custody or control of any governmental agency (includ-
12 ing any government-owned or government-controlled corpo-
13 ration) shall be directly or indirectly used by or made
14 available to the Commodity Credit Corporation to make any
15 subsidy or other payment, or to pay or absorb losses, on any
16 agricultural commodity or any commodity processed or manu-
17 factured in whole or substantial part therefrom, including
18 milk and livestock and the products thereof, either to reduce
19 or maintain, or in lieu of increasing, maximum prices estab-
20 lished on such commodities, except as provided in section 4
21 hereof: *Provided*, That with respect to any such commodities
22 for which subsidy programs or support prices have been
23 announced on or before October 13, 1943, such programs may
24 be carried out and such support prices may continue to be
25 maintained to the extent only that funds are available for

1 such purpose under existing law, but not beyond December
2 31, 1943: *Provided further*, That support prices shall con-
3 tinue to be announced for any such commodities pursuant to
4 section 4 of Public Law No. 147, approved July 1, 1941,
5 and section 8 of Public Law No. 729, approved October 2,
6 1942, but any maximum prices heretofore or hereafter estab-
7 lished for such commodities shall not be below the support
8 prices therefor or below the prices specified in section 3 of
9 Public Law No. 729, approved October 2, 1942: *Provided*
10 *further*, That none of the foregoing provisions shall apply
11 to any payments or losses incurred in transactions with respect
12 to competitive domestic vegetable oils and fats and oil seed.
13 SEC. 4. The Commodity Credit Corporation may sell at
14 a loss perishable fruits or vegetables, owned or controlled by
15 it, the increased production of which has been requested by
16 the War Food Administrator, if there is danger of substantial
17 loss through deterioration by spoilage.

78TH CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

H. R. 3458

A BILL

To continue the Commodity Credit Corporation as an agency of the United States, to revise the basis of annual appraisal of its assets, and for other purposes.

By Mr. STREAGALL

OCTOBER 14, 1943

Referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency

78TH CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

S. 1458

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

OCTOBER 18 (legislative day, OCTOBER 12), 1943

Mr. BANKHEAD introduced the following bill; which was read twice and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency

A BILL

To continue the Commodity Credit Corporation as an agency of the United States, to revise the basis of annual appraisal of its assets, and for other purposes.

1 *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representa-*
2 *tives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*
3 That section 1 of the Act approved March 8, 1938 (52 Stat.
4 107), as amended, is hereby amended by deleting from the
5 first sentence thereof the term "31st of March" where that
6 term first appears therein and substituting in lieu thereof the
7 term "30th of June", and by deleting from the second sen-
8 tence thereof "on the basis of the cost, including not more
9 than one year of carrying charges, of such assets of the
10 Corporation, or the average market prices of such assets for

1 a period of twelve months ending with March 31 of each
2 year, whichever is less" and inserting in lieu thereof "on
3 the basis of the cost, or, insofar as practicable, the average
4 market price of such assets during the last month of the
5 fiscal year covered by the appraisal, whichever is the lower".
6 The first appraisal of the assets and liabilities of the Com-
7 modity Credit Corporation on the basis established by this
8 amendment shall be made as of June 30, 1944.

9 SEC. 2. Section 7 of the Act approved January 31, 1935
10 (49 Stat. 4), as amended, is hereby amended by changing
11 the designation thereof to section 7 (a) ; by striking out in
12 the first sentence of such section "December 31, 1943" and
13 inserting in lieu thereof "June 30, 1945"; and by striking
14 out the period at the end of such section and inserting in
15 lieu thereof a colon and the following: "*Provided, however,*
16 *That the Corporation shall at all times maintain complete and*
17 *accurate books of account and shall determine the procedures*
18 *to be followed in the transaction of the corporate business.*

19 "(b) The financial transactions of the Corporation be-
20 ginning with the period from July 1, 1944, shall be audited
21 by the General Accounting Office in accordance with the
22 principles applicable to commercial corporate transactions and
23 under such rules and regulations as may be prescribed by
24 the Comptroller General of the United States: *Provided,*
25 *That the Corporation shall continue to have the authority to*

1 make final and conclusive settlement and adjustment of any
2 claims by or against the Corporation or the accounts of its
3 fiscal officers: *Provided further*, That a report of such audit
4 shall be made to the Congress, together with such recom-
5 mendations as the Comptroller General may deem advisable,
6 and that each such report shall cover a period of one fiscal
7 year: *Provided further*, That a copy of each such report shall
8 be furnished the Secretary of the Treasury and that the find-
9 ings contained therein shall be considered by the Secretary
10 in appraising the assets and liabilities and determining the
11 net worth of the Corporation under sections 1 and 2 of the
12 Act of March 8, 1938 (52 Stat. 107), as amended: *Provided*,
13 *however*, That nothing in this section shall be construed as
14 modifying legislation authorizing the use of funds of the
15 Corporation for administrative expenses and requiring ac-
16 countability therefor.

17 “(c) The expenses of the audit as provided in this sec-
18 tion may be paid up to and including June 30, 1946, from
19 moneys advanced therefor by the Corporation, or from any
20 appropriation or appropriations for the General Accounting
21 Office, and appropriations so used shall be reimbursed
22 promptly by the Corporation as billed by the Comptroller
23 General: *Provided*, That any such advances or reimburse-
24 ments shall be considered as nonadministrative expenses of
25 the Corporation. For the purpose of such audit the repre-

1 representatives of the General Accounting Office shall have access
2 to all papers, books, files, accounts, financial records, ware-
3 houses, and all other things, property, and places belonging
4 to or under the control of or used or employed by the Cor-
5 poration and shall be afforded full facilities for verifying
6 transactions with the balances in depositaries and with fiscal
7 agents: *Provided further*, That the certified financial reports
8 and schedules of the fiscal agents of the Corporation based on
9 commercial audits in the usual course of business may be ac-
10 cepted by the General Accounting Office in its audit of the
11 financial transactions of the Corporation as final and not sub-
12 ject to further audit verification.

13 “(d) Any examination of the corporate records shall
14 be made at the place or places where such records are nor-
15 mally kept in the transaction of the corporate business, and
16 the Corporation shall retain custody of contracts, vouchers,
17 schedules, or other financial or accounting documents, either
18 original or duplicate, relating to its ‘nonadministrative
19 transactions.’”

20 SEC. 3. No funds appropriated to, borrowed by, or in the
21 custody or control of any governmental agency (including
22 any Government-owned or Government-controlled corpora-
23 tion) shall be directly or indirectly used by or made available
24 to the Commodity Credit Corporation or any other govern-
25 mental agency, including any Government-owned or Govern-

1 ment-controlled corporation, to make any subsidy or other
2 payment, or to pay or absorb losses, on any agricultural
3 commodity or any commodity processed or manufactured in
4 whole or substantial part therefrom, including milk and live-
5 stock and the products thereof, either to reduce or maintain,
6 or in lieu of increasing, maximum prices established on such
7 commodities, except as provided in section 4 hereof: *Pro-*
8 *vided*, That with respect to any such commodities for which
9 subsidy programs or support prices have been announced on
10 or before October 13, 1943, such programs may be carried
11 out and such support prices may continue to be maintained to
12 the extent only that funds are available for such purpose un-
13 der existing law, but winding up and liquidating such pro-
14 grams shall proceed after December 31, 1943, and shall be
15 completed within a reasonable time not later than June 30,
16 1944: *Provided further*, That support prices shall continue
17 to be announced for any such commodities pursuant to section
18 4 of Public Law Numbered 147, approved July 1, 1941, as
19 amended, and loans shall continue to be made pursuant to
20 section 8 of Public Law Numbered 729, approved October 2,
21 1942, but any maximum prices heretofore or hereafter estab-
22 lished for such commodities shall not be below the support
23 prices therefor or below the prices specified in section 3 of
24 Public Law Numbered 729, approved October 2, 1942:
25 *Provided further*, That none of the foregoing provisions shall

1 apply to any payments or losses incurred in transactions with
2 respect to domestic vegetable oils and fats and oil seed and the
3 ingredients and products thereof: *And provided further*, That
4 nothing herein shall be construed to prevent the making of
5 parity payments, soil-conservation payments, or benefits to
6 sugar growers authorized under title III of the Sugar Act of
7 1937, as amended, or the sale of feed wheat as authorized by
8 existing law.

9 SEC. 4. The Commodity Credit Corporation may sell at
10 a loss perishable fruits or vegetables, owned or controlled by
11 it, the increased production of which has been requested by
12 the War Food Administrator, if there is danger of substantial
13 loss through deterioration by spoilage.

14 SEC. 5. The first sentence of section 4 of the Act ap-
15 proved March 8, 1938 (52 Stat. 108), as amended, is hereby
16 amended by striking out "\$3,000,000,000" and inserting in
17 lieu thereof "\$3,250,000,000".

A BILL

To continue the Commodity Credit Corporation as an agency of the United States, to revise the basis of annual appraisal of its assets, and for other purposes.

By Mr. BANKHEAD

OCTOBER 18 (legislative day, OCTOBER 12), 1943

Read twice and referred to the Committee on
Banking and Currency

S. J. RES. 99

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

DECEMBER 13 (legislative day, DECEMBER 7), 1943

Mr. ELLENDER introduced the following joint resolution; which was read twice
and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency

JOINT RESOLUTION

Continuing the Commodity Credit Corporation as an agency of
the United States, and fixing the date of meeting of the
second session of the Seventy-eighth Congress.

1 *Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives*
2 *of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*
3 That the first sentence of section 7 of the Act approved
4 January 31, 1935 (49 Stat. 4), as amended, is hereby
5 amended by striking out "December 31, 1943" and inserting
6 in lieu thereof "February 5, 1944".

7 SEC. 2. The second session of the Seventy-eighth Con-
8 gress shall begin at noon on Wednesday, January 12, 1944.

78TH CONGRESS
1ST Session

S. J. RES. 99

JOINT RESOLUTION

Continuing the Commodity Credit Corporation as an agency of the United States, and fixing the date of meeting of the second session of the Seventy-eighth Congress.

By Mr. ELLENDER

DECEMBER 13 (legislative day, DECEMBER 7), 1943

Read twice and referred to the Committee on
Banking and Currency

78TH CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

S. J. RES. 100

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

DECEMBER 13 (legislative day, DECEMBER 7), 1943

MR. ELLENDER introduced the following joint resolution; which was read twice
and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency

JOINT RESOLUTION

Continuing the Commodity Credit Corporation as an agency of
the United States.

1 *Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives*
2 *of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*
3 That the first sentence of section 7 of the Act approved
4 January 31, 1935 (49 Stat. 4), as amended, is hereby
5 amended by striking out "December 31, 1943" and inserting
6 in lieu thereof "February 5, 1944".

78TH CONGRESS
1ST Session

S. J. RES. 100

JOINT RESOLUTION

Continuing the Commodity Credit Corporation
as an agency of the United States.

By Mr. ERLENDER

DECEMBER 13 (legislative day, DECEMBER 7), 1943
Read twice and referred to the Committee on
Banking and Currency

S. 1458

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

DECEMBER 15, 1943

Referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency and ordered to be printed

AMENDMENT

Intended to be proposed by Mr. TAFT to the bill (S. 1458) to continue the Commodity Credit Corporation as an agency of the United States, to revise the basis of annual appraisal of its assets, and for other purposes, viz:

1 On page 5, strike out all of line 16 after the colon, and
2 all of lines 17 to 25, inclusive; also, on page 6, lines 1, 2,
3 and 3 to the colon in line 3, and insert: "*Provided further,*
4 That nothing herein shall apply to payments made to the
5 shippers of commodities or others to cover the increased
6 costs of transportation resulting from the war emergency.

7 "In order to secure the maximum necessary production
8 of agricultural commodities in the calendar year 1944, the
9 Administrator of the War Food Administration shall, as

1 soon as practicable after the passage of this Act, list and
2 announce such support prices as he finds necessary pursuant
3 to the provisions of section 4 of Public Law Numbered 147,
4 approved July 1, 1941, as amended, and of the Emergency
5 Price Control Act of 1942, as amended. Whenever any
6 such support price has been announced, the Administrator
7 shall maintain such price in the open market throughout the
8 United States (unless the support price is limited to par-
9 ticular marketing areas, in which case he shall maintain
10 such price in such areas) either by regulations fixing prices,
11 or by causing actual purchases to be made by some agency
12 of the United States Government. No maximum price here-
13 tofore or hereafter established for any commodity shall be
14 below the support price therefor so announced, or below
15 the prices specified in section 3 of Public Law Numbered
16 729, approved October 2, 1942. In any case in which a
17 support price for an agricultural commodity is announced
18 and maintained, and a fixed maximum ceiling is prescribed
19 for the sale by processors and distributors of any article
20 processed from such agricultural commodity the War Food
21 Administrator may direct the Commodity Credit Corpora-
22 tion to pay to the processor or distributor of any such article
23 an amount per unit of the processed article (without relation
24 to the profits of such processor or distributor) for the pur-
25 pose of reducing the margin between the producer and the

1 consumer: *Provided*, That such margin is reduced by the
2 amount of the payments made per unit by the Commodity
3 Credit Corporation. The Commodity Credit Corporation
4 may accomplish the same purpose, when it purchases any
5 agricultural commodity, by selling such commodity to the
6 processor to be used solely for the purpose of processing,
7 without affecting the general market price for such com-
8 modity. No support price shall be announced for beef cattle
9 or calves or the products thereof, and no subsidy therefor
10 shall be payable in connection therewith, but nothing shall
11 prevent the control of beef and veal prices by the regulation
12 of the margins of processors and distributors, and by ration-
13 ing. No subsidy shall be paid on liquid milk unless in any
14 particular area a support price is announced and maintained
15 to the producers of milk within that area, in which case pay-
16 ments may be made to the distributors of milk within such
17 area under the authority hereinbefore conferred as if such dis-
18 tributors were processors of milk, in order to reduce the
19 margin in the price of milk between the producer and the
20 consumer.

21 "The total payments made to processors and distributors
22 in the calendar year 1944 plus all losses taken by the Com-
23 modity Credit Corporation during said calendar year, under
24 the provisions of the preceding paragraph, shall not exceed
25 \$600,000,000."

78TH CONGRESS
1ST Session

S. 1458

AMENDMENT

Intended to be proposed by Mr. Tarr to the bill (S. 1458) to continue the Commodity Credit Corporation as an agency of the United States, to revise the basis of annual appraisal of its assets, and for other purposes.

DECEMBER 15, 1943

Referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency
and ordered to be printed

78TH CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

Calendar No. 613

S. J. RES. 103

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

DECEMBER 16 (legislative day, DECEMBER 15), 1943

Mr. BARKLEY, from the Committee on Banking and Currency, reported the following joint resolution; which was read twice and placed on the calendar

JOINT RESOLUTION

Continuing the Commodity Credit Corporation as an agency of the United States.

- 1 *Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives*
- 2 *of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*
- 3 That the first sentence of section 7 of the Act approved
- 4 January 31, 1935 (49 Stat. 4), as amended, is hereby
- 5 amended by striking out "December 31, 1943" and inserting
- 6 in lieu thereof "February 29, 1944".

78TH CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

S. J. RES. 103

JOINT RESOLUTION

Continuing the Commodity Credit Corporation
as an agency of the United States.

By Mr. BARKLEY

DECEMBER 16 (legislative day, DECEMBER 15), 1943

Read twice and placed on the calendar

They were indicted for a conspiracy to cheat the Government through the delivery of defective propeller sleeves to the Navy, the crime being made possible by the use of fake tests. Evidence supporting the charges was obtained in a surprise raid by agents of the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

Despite the enormity of the offense, Judge Kloeb made an effort to minimize if not actually to defend it. "It is not difficult to understand," he said, "why a company, under pressure from the Government to increase production, may be tempted to violate some of the specifications." The fines, Judge Kloeb revealed, will be paid by the company, which means that they will probably be passed on to the Government under its cost-plus-fixed-fee contract with the Navy.

That is the situation. I have before me the records in other cases. I do not know just how much interest there is in them. To me they are very interesting and very revealing.

Mr. President, a moment ago I said that the poor man—and by that I mean the common man, the average farmer, the small merchant, and the laboring man—did not have much chance. That is true. During the short time I have been a Member of this body several instances have arisen to prove that statement.

I remember that one day when we were considering a tax bill to raise \$160,000,000 of revenue, it was proposed that we place a use tax of \$5 on every car. That measure was enacted into law. I voted against it, as did 31 other Senators. The distinguished senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] made a magnificent speech against it, but it passed.

What is the result? A rich man may have an automobile costing \$20,000, and a poor sharecropper in the darkest part of North Dakota or Mississippi may buy an old "jitney" for \$15 so that he can go to town on Sunday afternoon. Call him a hired man, a hobo, or an I. W. W., if you will. Those poor people are called many names. All they are good for is to do the hard work, anyway. The use tax is the same on that \$15 car as it is on the \$20,000 car. This is in America, Mr. President.

I shall not go into all the tax matters today, because I expect to speak on the tax bill when it comes before the Senate. I see before me Senators who have been here a long time and who are eminently better qualified to speak on these matters than I am. I have not the slightest doubt that they would do so if they were not so busy in their committees.

In the tax bill which is now being considered by the Senate Finance Committee an effort is being made to tax cooperatives. I give notice now that when the measure comes before the Senate, if an attempt is made to tax cooperatives I shall offer an amendment to tax foundations such as the Rockefeller Foundation, the Carnegie Foundation, and all the other 119 foundations which today are tax-exempt, organizations which, without one dollar's worth of buildings, have assets of more than \$1,000,000,000. If a cooperative, composed of a few farmers who are trying to solve the problem of distribution, is to be taxed, then, by the eternal gods, the Rockefeller Foundation and all the other foundations, with \$1,000,000,000 worth of

tax-exempt property, should also be taxed. As I have said, I am not discussing the matter of taxes today.

If House bill 1203 becomes the law of the land, Mr. President, then our jury system will be gone. The method of administering the law will be gone, because in every single suit involving crooks and racketeers who have defrauded the Government the Attorney General will be the prosecutor, the judge, and the jury, all in one.

Mr. President, I cannot believe that the Senate will ever pass a measure so violative of all that we have been taught in this country as constituting justice.

There are a great many objections to the bill. Every reason which existed for the enactment of the informers' statute during the administration of Abraham Lincoln exists today; and every reason—if any—which exists today for the repeal of that law existed when it was signed by President Abraham Lincoln.

At the time of the passage of the informer bill it was the sentiment of the Congress and of President Abraham Lincoln that the Government of the United States of America was a people's government—a government truly, actually, and realistically "of the people, by the people and for the people." They believed that the citizens of the Nation should be given an opportunity to have an active part in our Government. If Government officials did not do their full duty promptly and effectively, then the people, through statutes such as the informer law, would have the opportunity of taking action into their own hands to prevent the theft or squandering of public funds.

Unfortunately for our Nation, during the past 10 years, the tendency has been in exactly the opposite direction, namely, to concentrate all power in the hands of a few governmental officials in Washington; to place all the power of government not in the hands of the people, not even in the hands of the servants of the people, but in governmental officials in Washington, most of whom today take the position that they are the rulers or masters of the people.

The purpose of the informer statute when enacted was twofold, as is the purpose of continuing its existence today and in the future. Its existence is a perpetual threat to wrongdoers. With this statute as a part of our law, those who would steal or wantonly waste public funds realize that if the Attorney General or his assistants are too busy, or for some other reason fail to prosecute and seek the recovery of the wasted funds, they still have to fear actions brought under the informer statute. The other purpose of the statute is to furnish a spur to Government law-enforcement officials who may be too busy, or for some other reason do not take vigorous action against those who defraud the Government.

While there is no greater moral reason for the Informer Statute today than when it was enacted, there is a greater pecuniary reason for its continuance. With this country soon to be in debt hundreds of billions of dollars, there is more need than ever before in the life of our

Nation for every possible means for the preservation of public funds, or for the recovery of those wasted or stolen. Under those circumstances we should be strengthening the Informer Statute instead of emasculating it. We should be passing similar laws instead of repealing this one.

The only excuse advanced for the destruction of this safeguard of our people and of their money, is that a few suits have been brought in the country based on indictments by the Government without independent investigation and information on the part of the plaintiffs. Nobody condones actions of that sort. The Informer Statute can easily be amended to prevent repetition of that type of litigation without terminating the real virtues of the law as would be done by the passage of the bill now being considered.

This bill would make impossible honest, patriotic, worth while informer suits such as the one that has been brought by former Gov. Payne H. Ratner of Kansas and his associates against the contractors who built the Sunflower Ordnance Plant near DeSoto, Kansas. That suit was brought as the result of independent investigation, and information on the part of the plaintiff in the case, and on the part of Governor Ratner and his cocounsel. It was not brought until several months after public officials were notified of the graft and waste at this plant built with public funds. The suit was not filed until months after governmental officials had had an opportunity to do something on their account about the situation. After months had passed without any prosecution, or a suit for the recovery of money having been started by the Government, the action was filed for William V. Ryan by Governor Ratner, former Circuit Judge Marion D. Waltner of Kansas City, and their associate counsel.

Every Member of the Senate is familiar with what has taken place since that lawsuit was filed. I need not go into it further at this time. I can only say, Mr. President, that to me it seems that it will be going back far indeed in the jurisprudence of this country if somehow, in some way, whether by the bill now sought to be enacted into law or by some other law, the right of the average man, the right of the average citizen, shall be taken away from him so that he cannot prosecute war frauds, so that the lawyer he retains cannot prosecute them, and so that the United States district attorney cannot prosecute them, but under the statute only one man, namely, the Attorney General of the United States, will have that power.

Mr. President, I believe that in view of the nature of the measure under consideration, one which involves billions upon billions of dollars, as stated by the distinguished chairman of the Senate Judiciary Committee, there should be a quorum present. Inasmuch as I believe that there is not now a quorum present, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma in the chair). The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

| | | |
|--------------|-----------------|---------------|
| Andrews | Gerry | Nye |
| Austin | Gillette | O'Mahoney |
| Bailey | Green | Overton |
| Ball | Guffey | Radcliffe |
| Bankhead | Gurney | Reed |
| Barkley | Hatch | Robertson |
| Brewster | Hawkes | Russell |
| Bridges | Hayden | Smith |
| Brooks | Hill | Stewart |
| Buck | Holman | Taft |
| Burton | Johnson, Calif. | Thomas, Idaho |
| Bushfield | Johnson, Colo. | Thomas, Okla. |
| Butler | Kilgore | Thomas, Utah |
| Byrd | La Follette | Truman |
| Capper | Langer | Tunnell |
| Caraway | Lodge | Tydings |
| Chandler | Lucas | Vandenberg |
| Chavez | McCarran | Van Nuys |
| Clark, Idaho | McClellan | Wallgren |
| Clark, Mo. | McFarland | Walsh, Mass. |
| Connally | McKellar | Walsh, N. J. |
| Davis | Maloney | Wheeler |
| Downey | Maybank | Wherry |
| Eastland | Mead | White |
| Ellender | Millikin | Wiley |
| Ferguson | Moore | Willis |
| George | Murray | |

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS], the Senator from Utah [Mr. MURDOCK], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. O'DANIEL] are absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. BILEBO], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. REYNOLDS], and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] is absent on official business, holding hearings in the State of Mississippi.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. SCRUGHAM] is detained on public business.

Mr. WHITE. The Senator from Oregon [Mr. McNARY], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. SHIPSTEAD], and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. WILSON] are absent because of illness.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is absent because of public matters.

The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB] and the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DANAHY] are absent because of illness.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McFARLAND in the chair). Eighty Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the conference report on House bill 1203.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, just one more matter, and then I shall conclude.

Within the last few days we have had before us a subject involving States' rights. The question was as to the right of a State as against the Federal Government.

If the pending conference report bill shall become law, it will mean that a man residing in any State will have nothing at all to say about any action being brought against those who may be guilty of committing war frauds. It will mean that no State will have a right to bring suit, no individual will have a right to bring suit, the only man in all the world who can bring one of these actions will be, in the last analysis, the Attorney General of the United States.

Mr. President, in view of the grave importance of this measure, I believe the bill should be recommitted to the committee of conference with instructions to determine whether, after further conference, they cannot report a more satisfactory bill.

I therefore move that the bill be recommitted to the committee of conference, and that the conferees on the part of the Senate be instructed to confer again with the House conferees and see whether a better bill cannot be produced.

Mr. WHITE. A parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. WHITE. What is the question before the Senate?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion of the Senator from North Dakota to recommit the conference report to the committee of conference, with instructions.

The motion was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report on House bill 1203.

The report was agreed to.

CONTINUATION OF COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from North Dakota yield?

Mr. LANGER. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. By direction of the Committee on Banking and Currency I report favorably for the calendar an original joint resolution extending the life of the Commodity Credit Corporation for a period of 60 days. I ask that it go on the calendar.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the report will be received and the joint resolution will be placed on the calendar.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 103) continuing the Commodity Credit Corporation as an agency of the United States, was read twice by its title and ordered to be placed on the calendar.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2207) to amend the Nationality Act of 1940; asked a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. DICKSTEIN, Mr. LESINSKI, and Mr. MASON were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message also announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 2350) to liberalize the service pension laws relating to veterans of the War with Spain, the Philippine Insurrection, and the China Relief Expedition, and their dependents, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H. R. 2350) to liberalize the service pension laws relating to veterans of the War with Spain, the Philippine Insurrection, and the China Relief Expedition, and their dependents, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

RECESS

Mr. McKELLAR. I move that the Senate take a recess until tomorrow at 12 o'clock noon.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 3 o'clock and 20 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Friday, December 17, 1943, at 12 o'clock noon.

W
or

Is
or

renc
lar

sagr

shall be subject to deportation under the immigration laws, and in the event such person was a national of the United States by birth, the deportation shall be to any country of which any ancestor from whom he inherits or derives United States nationality was a citizen or subject."

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, it will be noted that under paragraph "i," one of the conditions enumerated is "expressing a refusal to swear unqualified allegiance to the United States of America or to forswear any form of allegiance or obedience to any foreign country." This provision is particularly aimed at the American-born Japanese who gave negative answers to question 28 in a questionnaire submitted to them by the War Relocation Authority. The question was:

Will you swear unqualified allegiance to the United States of America and forswear any form of allegiance or obedience to the Japanese Emperor or any other foreign government, power, or organization?

Mr. President, I call attention to the fact that this question was submitted to 19,979 male Japanese of 17 years of age or older, and of this number 4,850 gave a nonaffirmative answer; in other words, 25.4 percent of the Japanese males born in this country admit that they owe allegiance to Japan. This same question was submitted to 18,486 female Japanese born in the United States who were 17 years of age or older, and 1,487 gave "no" for an answer.

Mr. President, I say that any men or women born in the United States who have enjoyed our Nation of liberty and justice and who, in this crisis, thus admit that they owe allegiance to the Japanese Government, are no longer entitled to call themselves citizens of our country and should be deported immediately after the war.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. STEWART. I am very much interested in the Senator's bill, in the introduction of which I agreed to join with him, of course, and at a later date I hope to have something to say on the subject. Does the Senator have any figures, other than those he has quoted, that indicate how many of the native-born Japanese gave negative answers to the question which would indicate or was a test of their loyalty to the United States?

Mr. McFARLAND. I have only the figures I have just quoted. There may be other figures now available.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, does the Senator know how many American-born Japanese there are in the United States who are claiming citizenship by reason of birth?

Mr. McFARLAND. I cannot answer the Senator's question. I do not see how any native-born Japanese or any other person could claim American citizenship who admits that he owes allegiance to another country.

Mr. STEWART. I agree with the Senator. I think he is exactly right.

Mr. McFARLAND. Twenty-five percent, if you please, of the male Japanese born in this country admit that they owe

allegiance to another nation—namely, Japan.

Mr. STEWART. I believe the Senator stated the number of questionnaires submitted was approximately 19,000.

Mr. McFARLAND. Questionnaires were submitted to 19,979 male Japanese, and of that number 4,850 gave nonaffirmative answers to the questions. Some of them did not answer the questions.

Mr. STEWART. How many questionnaires were submitted to females?

Mr. McFARLAND. Questions were submitted to 18,486 females.

Mr. STEWART. That would make a total of about 37,000. If my memory is correct, that is not more than half of the native-born Japanese of the United States. I wonder why the questionnaire was not submitted to them all.

Mr. McFARLAND. I cannot answer the Senator's question, but I think that question should be answered. I think we should find out.

Mr. STEWART. I simply wish to say to the Senator that I am very much interested in his bill, and, as I said, I am glad to be coauthor of the bill and will watch its progress with interest, and shall be glad to help it along. I hope it will be passed. I have heretofore introduced so-called anti-Japanese legislation myself.

Mr. McFARLAND. I was about to say that I did not call this proposal anti-Japanese, but it is, because the persons involved are 100 percent Japanese. Only those who refuse to swear allegiance to our country are involved.

Mr. STEWART. I thank the Senator.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I call attention to the fact that section (g) of our bill makes it mandatory upon the Attorney General to bring action to cancel the citizenship of those who have by their course of conduct or utterance indicated that they adhere to or bear allegiance and fidelity to a foreign country. The second paragraph makes those who have lost their citizenship under the provisions of paragraph (i) or (j) subject to deportation under the immigration laws of the United States.

Mr. President, we could have made our bill broader, but we have confined it to those who, without question, are not citizens of the United States at heart, and who have admitted by writing or utterance that they owe allegiance to a foreign country. The figures which I have just given are taken from the report of a subcommittee on Japanese war relocation centers, of which the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER] was chairman, and are found on pages 48 and 49 of the report.

Mr. President, we cannot afford to allow these people to continue to enjoy the blessings of our great Nation. It is time that we see to it that the United States is 100 percent American. Let us send these people to the country of their love. We have no place for them here.

AMENDMENT TO THE REVENUE BILL

Mr. ANDREWS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 3687) to provide revenue, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed.

INVESTIGATION OF CONDITIONS IN PUERTO RICO—LIMIT OF EXPENDITURES

Mr. CHAVEZ submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 222), which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Resolved, That the limit of expenditures authorized by Senate Resolution 26, agreed to January 28, 1943, authorizing the subcommittee of the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs to hold hearings during the Seventy-eighth Congress, is hereby increased by \$15,000.

ADDRESS BY SENATOR WILEY BEFORE ASSOCIATION OF FINANCE COMPANIES, MILWAUKEE, WIS.

[Mr. WILEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by him before the Association of Finance Companies, Milwaukee, Wis., December 11, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

STATEMENTS BY SENATOR HILL AND REPRESENTATIVES EATON, MAY, AND BLOOM ON ANNOUNCEMENT OF TEHRAN CONFERENCE

[Mr. HILL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD radio statements made by him and by Representatives EATON, MAY, and BLOOM at the time of the announcement of the Tehran Conference, December 6, 1943, which appear in the Appendix.]

A 1944 PROGRAM FOR THE REPUBLICANS—ARTICLE BY SENATOR TAFT

[Mr. WILLIS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "A 1944 Program for the Republicans," written by Senator TAFT and published in the Saturday Evening Post of December 11, which appears in the Appendix.]

RELIGIOUS LIBERTY THE ONLY BASIS FOR A JUST AND DURABLE PEACE—ARTICLE BY L. L. GWALTNEY

[Mr. HILL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Religious Liberty the Only Basis for a Just and Durable Peace," by L. L. Gwaltney, editor, the Alabama Baptist, Birmingham, Ala., which will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

ANGELS AT MEAUX, FRANCE—A CHRISTMAS STORY BY JOE MITCHELL PILCHER

[Mr. HILL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a Christmas story entitled "Angels at Meaux, France," written by Joe Mitchell Pilcher, which appears in the Appendix.]

CONTINUATION OF COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION

Mr. BARKLEY. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate Joint Resolution 103 which extends until the 29th day of February the life of the Commodity Credit Corporation.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Kentucky.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 103) continuing the Commodity Credit Corporation as an agency of the United States.

The joint resolution was read as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the first sentence of section 7 of the act approved January 31, 1935 (49 Stat. 4), as amended, is hereby amended by striking out "December 31, 1943"

and inserting in lieu thereof "February 29, 1944."

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED] advised me yesterday that he wanted, not to oppose the joint resolution, but to make some remarks in connection with it. He is not at the moment in the Chamber, but I understand is on his way. I therefore suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HATCH in the chair). The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

| | | |
|--------------|-----------------|---------------|
| Aiken | George | Murray |
| Andrews | Gerry | Nye |
| Austin | Gillette | Overton |
| Bailey | Green | Radcliffe |
| Ball | Gurney | Reed |
| Bankhead | Hatch | Robertson |
| Barkley | Hawkes | Russell |
| Bone | Hayden | Smith |
| Brewster | Hill | Stewart |
| Brooks | Holman | Taft |
| Buck | Johnson, Calif. | Thomas, Idaho |
| Burton | Johnson, Colo. | Thomas, Okla. |
| Bushfield | Kilgore | Thomas, Utah |
| Butler | La Follette | Truman |
| Byrd | Langer | Tunnell |
| Capper | Lodge | Tydings |
| Caraway | Lucas | Vandenberg |
| Chavez | McCarran | Van Nuys |
| Clark, Idaho | McClellan | Wallgren |
| Clark, Mo. | McFarland | Walsh, Mass. |
| Connally | McKellar | Walsh, N. J. |
| Davis | Maloney | Wheeler |
| Downey | Maybank | Wherry |
| Eastland | Mead | White |
| Ellender | Millikin | Wiley |
| Ferguson | Moore | Willis |

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Seventy-eight Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS], the Senator from Utah [Mr. MURDOCK], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. O'DANIEL] are absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. BELBO], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. REYNOLDS], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. GUFFEY], and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER], are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] is absent on official business, holding hearings in the State of Mississippi.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. SCRUGHAM] is detained on public business.

Mr. WHITE. The Senator from Oregon [Mr. McNARY], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DANAHY], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. SHIPSTEAD], and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. WILSON] are absent because of illness.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is absent on public business.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I wish to make a very brief statement in regard to Senate Joint Resolution 103, which is now before the Senate.

As we all know, the Commodity Credit Corporation was created long before the war, and long before anyone thought about war, and has served a very useful

purpose to the farmers of the United States. Last July we extended its life until the 31st day of December of this year. In the meantime the House of Representatives has passed a bill extending its life with certain prohibitions in regard to subsidies. That bill was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency of the Senate, and exhaustive hearings were had upon it, lasting 2 weeks or more, and the committee has been considering the House bill. In the meantime, the senior Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD] introduced a bill in the Senate embodying the provisions of the House bill, with some slight modifications.

The Senate Committee on Banking and Currency has been in session attempting to frame a bill which would be reasonably satisfactory to the Congress and to the country, but it has been unable to do so. Yesterday it declined to report the House bill, or the Bankhead bill, or any amendments thereto. It is obvious that we cannot legislate on the subsidy question between now and Christmas, or between now and the reassembling of the Congress on the 3d day of January, or on whatever day Congress may agree to reassemble. So that the Commodity Credit Corporation would automatically expire on the 31st day of December.

No one would like to see that occur. It is generally agreed, without regard to whether men are for or against the program of subsidies now in force, that the life of the Commodity Credit Corporation should be extended because of the useful work it does in other fields.

The committee authorized me yesterday to submit a resolution extending the life of the Commodity Credit Corporation for practically 60 days, or until the 29th day of February, the next year being a leap year, and there being 29 days in the month of February. Practically, it extends its life for 58 days.

In view of the fact that the Finance Committee will not be able to report the tax bill until next week, we will not be able to dispose of that measure until after the reassembling of Congress in January, and if the proposed extension until the end of February is agreed to, it is my hope and belief that we can work out a bill before another expiration of the life of the Commodity Credit Corporation legislation, and it will be, I think I may say, the obligation and the effort of the Committee on Banking and Currency, without regard to the length of any recess or the date on which Congress may reassemble, to try to have a bill for presentation to the Senate as soon as possible after the reconvening of the Seventy-eighth Congress in its second session.

Therefore the committee felt that the resolution of extension, simply changing the date of the expiration of the life of the Commodity Credit Corporation from December 31, 1943, to February 29, 1944, was justified.

There was some fear expressed in some quarters that the proposed extension would result in the War Food Administration, or the Commodity Credit Corporation, or the O. P. A., or the Recon-

struction Finance Corporation, or some other agency that has been dealing with or has the power to deal with subsidies, broadening the program to include other commodities than those already included in it.

I wish to say that I have consulted on that subject Justice Byrnes, who is the Director of War Mobilization; I have conferred with Mr. Jesse Jones, who has charge of the operations of the R. F. C.; I have conferred with Judge Marvin Jones, who is the War Food Administrator, and with the heads of all the agencies that have anything to do with the inauguration of subsidies, and I am authorized to say on their behalf on the floor of the Senate that if the joint resolution is passed no additional commodity will be taken into the subsidy program during the period of the extension.

The subsidy program is now running at the rate of \$1,100,000,000 a year; it runs somewhere between \$90,000,000 and \$100,000,000 a month. That would mean that during the 2 months, that proportion of the \$1,100,000,000 would be all that those in charge of the program would feel like expending, because they recognize the situation which exists here, and they have very frankly said to me that they would not feel at liberty to go beyond what they are doing in the way of commodities or in the proportional amount expended during this period of extension.

I am glad to make that statement to my friends in the Senate and to the country, so that there will be no doubt at all about the effect of the joint resolution extending the life of the Commodity Credit Corporation.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I am very grateful to the Senator from Kentucky for the assurance he has given to the Senate, and particularly those of us who are primarily concerned with the subsidy program, that it will not be enlarged during the period in question. I wish to say to the Senator from Kentucky, as I told him yesterday in conversation when we discussed the matters which he has now mentioned, and which I propose to discuss, that so far as I am concerned, I am not opposed to the joint resolution; in fact, I think perhaps it is necessary, at least highly desirable, to pass it.

Mr. President, I realize that we are at the end of a long session, and there are a number of important matters which must be disposed of today. There is nothing, however, that is of more importance to the country than the subject I shall proceed to discuss. I had expected to discuss it in support of the bill of the distinguished Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD], if it had come out of the committee. However, the subject should be discussed, anyway. I shall be as brief as possible considering the need for a full discussion of the matter involved.

What the country needs is more information and less propaganda about the so-called inflation situation. Administration spokesmen have screamed exaggeration and distortion at the top of their voices to a point where the country is bewildered and alarmed. It seems

harsh to say that this bewilderment and alarm was deliberately caused, but surely administrative spokesmen cannot be so dumb or ignorant of the facts as their public utterances would indicate.

Administration spokesmen, and this does not exclude the President, Justice Byrnes, Judge Vinson, O. P. A. Bowles, or most of the others, have constantly confused subsidies with price ceilings in the public mind. Conversations I have had with, and letters I have received from, my constituents and others, show a widespread belief, based upon what these men have said, that the discontinuance of the subsidy policy being followed would mean the end of all control over prices. This simply is not so. Nothing could be farther from the truth. Much as I dislike to make the charge, I cannot escape the feeling that administration spokesmen are deliberately trying to plant this fear in the public mind.

As a matter of fact, the use of subsidies is a minor factor in the control of prices. It touches only a limited number of items and then only to a limited extent. If this subsidy policy were dropped and prices permitted to adjust themselves under O. P. A. rules and limitations, and no public mention made of the change, it is doubtful if it would be greatly noticed by consumers in general. Jim Byrnes, Fred Vinson, and Chester Bowles shriek at the top of their voices that subsidies are necessary to prevent ruinous inflation, that if a stubborn and obstinate Congress refuses to supply money and authority for that policy, the United States of America is threatened with immediate financial destruction. The spokesmen of an honest administration would not follow such a false and disturbing course. This administration is not honest either with the people or the Congress. The fact that the administration has not kept faith with the Congress, that it has constantly disregarded legislative enactment and usurped powers far beyond the authority of any statute, is one of the main reasons why Congress is disinclined to trust it further. The attitude of the Congress cannot be fully understood without consideration of this fact. The people are entitled to more truth and candor, and less "bunk."

So much misinformation has been handed out by administration spokesmen about high food prices and the cost of living that the public naturally assumes that prices, including prices of food, are higher than ever before—so high, in fact, as to constitute a threat to the average consumer of the country.

Nothing could be farther from the truth. Through the 1920's we had what was and is regarded as a reasonably normal period of business prosperity. The sum total of prices of all articles going into the cost of living is less now than it was in the period from 1923 to 1929. The year 1926 has been used by dependable statistical agencies as a base year for comparison of prices and living costs. On November 15, 1943, the cost of food was 99.9 percent of the average cost of food in 1926. Similarly, clothing on November 15, 1943, was 110.3 percent, house furnishings 106.5 percent, miscellaneous items 114.7 percent of the 1926

prices. Food has increased in price less than any of the other major factors mentioned. All items going into the cost of living, taken together, on November 15, 1943, were 98.2 percent of the 1926 average.

In order to support their distortion of the actual situation, all of the spokesmen for the administration, including the President, Justice Byrnes, Judge Vinson, and Mr. Bowles, use 1935-39 prices as a basis from which to calculate. These prices are not representative. They are subnormal. The depth of the depression in the thirties was reached in 1932 and 1933, and had not recovered to anything like an average normal basis in 1939. In fact, cost-of-living prices from 1935-39 were lower than in any year or sequence of years since 1918, save alone the depth of the depression years in 1932 and 1933. This is especially true of food prices.

To make its point and support its distortion of the facts, the administration's spokesmen are using depressed or subnormal prices with which to compare the current price level, both of food and other articles that go into the cost of living.

Whence comes this desperate cry from Byrnes, Jones, Bowles, not to omit the President, that we are threatened with inflation because prices are running away with us? They lay special emphasis upon food prices. This is not the first time this administration, lead by President Roosevelt, has unfairly and unnecessarily alarmed the country. The President followed that course in his message to Congress on Labor Day in 1942. In that message, he charged the farmer with being a profiteer, and held food prices to be responsible for the high cost of living and demanded that they be stabilized. In most of his public utterances he has taken the same attitude toward the farmer, the stockman, and the food producers of the country. It is an outrage upon fairness to so continuously misrepresent an important segment of the population of the United States engaged in the all-important task of producing food and more food for the Nation, for our armed forces, and for Lend-Lease. Surely, common decency should demand that the Chief Executive of the United States should speak the truth and tell the people honestly what the facts are, and deal fairly with the farmer and food producers of the Nation. This he has not done.

I challenge the candor, the integrity, and the honesty of this administration. It has been, and is now, misleading the people of the country. It is causing undue alarm and great concern for alleged causes which, when examined, have no foundation in truth or in fact.

Food prices have not gone up since 1926, but incomes have. The average income per person not on farms in the United States in 1926 was \$856. In July 1943 the average income per person in the United States was \$1,052—an increase of 23 percent over 1926. The industrial worker has done even better than that. In 1926, the wage income per industrial worker was \$1,318. In July 1943 the wage income per industrial

worker was at the rate of \$2,138 per annum. For the industrial worker, the 1943 income is 162 percent of his 1926 income—an increase of 62 percent over these years.

But the industrial worker, as well as the average citizen, is paying less for his food in 1943 than in 1926. This is the outstanding and important circumstance when we come to consider this problem. No spokesman for the administration has ever remotely referred to this all-important fact. Constantly they have increased the fears of the people of the country by ignoring the correct comparison, and using only a comparison with depressed prices at subnormal levels.

GOVERNMENT BY DIRECTIVE

What the country needs is more government by law, and less by decree. When, as an average citizen, I would read about government by decree in various countries—for example, in France and Germany in the pre-war period—I used to wonder just what it meant. Out of experience in our own country, I have come to know. Practically all effective government in the United States of America is now by decree, only we call it directive. Laws passed by Congress are either ignored or deliberately flouted by administrative agencies, taking their cue from the Chief Executive and Commander in Chief. This Commander in Chief stuff is a favorite phrase of those who choose to ignore constitutional limitations and legislative enactments.

There is no authority for the use of subsidies as they are now being used, except Presidential directive. The only authority of Congress for the use of subsidies is in the Emergency Price Control Act of January 30, 1942.

Paragraph (e), section 2, of that act reads in part as follows:

The Administrator * * * may * * * make subsidy payments to domestic producers * * * in such amounts * * * as he determines to be necessary to obtain the maximum necessary production.

There is other language in the same section and paragraph, all along the same line. Subsidies were to be used only to increase production. That was the central idea of the Congress, and the Price Administrator was given authority to use subsidies only to increase production. The indiscriminate use of subsidies as a rebate on grocery bills, at the expense of taxpayers, was never contemplated in any of the acts through which the Congress has given authority to the Commander in Chief. In fact, the application of the term Commander in Chief is greatly abused. George Washington, Abraham Lincoln, and Woodrow Wilson never dreamed of claiming more civil authority as President of the United States by virtue of their constitutional position of Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy of the United States, and of the Militia of the several States. The usurpation of authority by the present President of the United States, under the pretext of being Commander in Chief, exceeds anything in our history.

No wonder that every election in which the people have an opportunity to ex-

press their views of this administration shows a steadily increasing resentment against usurpation of authority through bureaucratic control. In this particular situation we are seeing bureaucratic dictatorship at its worst.

INFLATION

In the last few years we have emerged from a period of depression during which prices of all commodities, and especially foods, were subnormal. The American farmer, the American businessman, and the American manufacturer—in fact, the whole country—would become bankrupt if it had to continue business on the basis of the price levels and the volume of business obtaining from 1932 to 1939. Only 1 year in this period, 1937, showed an approach to normal business. All the other years were plainly years of depressed prices and subnormal business.

Beginning about January 1, 1940, we came into a period of increasing prices on all commodities. In the past 4 years prices have substantially increased. Food prices started at a lower level than commodity prices generally and had a steeper climb to make before they approached a normal level.

But this increase in prices does not by any means spell inflation—at least, true inflation. As I have pointed out elsewhere, the present price level is not above, and in many respects is definitely below, that of the last period of normally prosperous business in the country—namely, the years from 1922 to 1930. Again using 1926 as a basis of comparison, let me call attention to the following essential factors which must be given complete consideration in any adequate determination of our present situation:

In 1926 the United States Government collected \$4,100,000,000 in taxes.

In 1942 the United States Government collected \$16,400,000,000 in taxes.

In 1943 the United States Government collected \$34,500,000,000 in taxes.

On November 30, 1926, the national debt was \$19,400,000,000.

On November 30, 1942, the national debt was \$100,400,000,000.

On November 30, 1943, the national debt was \$170,300,000,000.

In 1926 the national income was \$77,000,000,000.

In 1942 the national income was \$120,000,000,000.

The national income is estimated to be \$148,000,000,000 for 1943.

November 30, 1926, the amount of money in circulation was \$4,800,000,000.

November 30, 1942, the amount of money in circulation was \$4,800,000,000.

November 30, 1943, the amount of money in circulation was \$19,900,000,000.

From 1926 to 1943 taxes increased 800 percent; the national debt increased 900 percent; the national income approximately doubled; the amount of money in circulation—that is, in the hands of the people—available for purchases increased 400 percent.

In the name of God Almighty, the Constitution, and everything else that is holy, how can anybody, even a dumb and dishonest administration, expect prices to remain static, or even be held to some recent level in the face of these factors? It is just one of the impossible things, so

impossible that no honest man clothed with authority and any sense of responsibility to the people should hold out for a moment that anything of the kind could be done.

An increase in the present price level over former price levels is only to be expected. We have exceeded the depressed levels of the years 1935 to 1939, but we have only now approached the average price level of a reasonably normal prosperous business period from 1923 to 1930.

Where is the inflation? Where is the threat to the country? Where is there any basis for the wild notes of alarm that administration spokesmen have sounded and are sounding? It is their distortion, misrepresentation, and exaggeration that has alarmed unnecessarily the people of the country.

I stand here on the floor of the Senate today and challenge the intelligence or the integrity of the men who have done this thing. I have supported what I have said today by the best authority in the United States—namely, the Bureau of Labor Statistics, of the Department of Labor, and the Bureau of Agricultural Economics, of the Department of Agriculture. These two statistical agencies are recognized on every hand as being able and honest. No one questions their ability or their integrity. They have furnished me with the facts. Every single statement I have made today rests upon a foundation provided for me for this purpose. I asked them for the facts. They gave me the facts. I have laid the facts before the Senate and the country.

These facts indict an administration that has shown indecision, vacillation, and a lack of either integrity or intelligence in dealing with these all-important factors which concern the welfare of our country.

THE BUTTER SUBSIDY

The economic unsoundness of the administration's subsidy program is clearly illustrated in the butter subsidy. In June, butter prices were rolled back 5 cents a pound. At the same time, a payment to the butter processors of 5 cents per pound was made out of the Treasury.

For every dollar of reduction in butter prices to the consumer, \$1 of the taxpayers' money is taken from the Treasury to pay a subsidy to the processor. This is not quite all. There is the administrative expense of handling the subsidy which must be added to the burden placed upon the taxpayer. This expense probably runs between 3 and 5 percent of the sums paid.

In other words, the taxpayer pays from \$1.03 to \$1.05 as an offset to every dollar of rebate upon the consumer purchases of butter.

I do not mean to say that this can be applied to all of the various forms of subsidies. In some cases, undoubtedly, the reduction in the consumer's grocery bill is larger than the assessment against the taxpayer. Butter, however, is the clearest illustration of the extreme economic folly of the roll-back subsidy.

THE FIXED-INCOME CLASS

There is a segment of our population whose income is rigid, or so nearly rigid, as to be called the fixed-income class.

I have endeavored to obtain the precise extent of this class of our people. I have been unable to get anything like exact figures. The Bureau of Labor Statistics tells me that out of thirty to forty million families in the country, perhaps 5,000,000, or about one-eighth, fall into this class.

There is no doubt about the hardship which a rise in prices inflicts upon this class of people. It is true, of course, that this same class profited through the depression period. With fixed incomes, their purchasing power was greatest when prices were the lowest. The higher prices go the greater the difficulties in which they find themselves.

I wish there were some way whereby relief could be given this class of people. We cannot base our whole economy, or a sound economic policy, upon what is perhaps one-eighth of our people. One of the methods suggested to give this class relief has been the application of a food-stamp plan something like that used for persons on relief through the blue stamps issued through some of the depression years.

One trouble with that plan is that many, perhaps most, of this class of our citizens, would refuse to accept any aid of that kind. I have discussed this matter with numerous of my colleagues, but so far no one has been able to suggest any other plan of help for these people, who are among the most responsible and worthy of our entire citizenship.

THE EFFECT OF DISCONTINUING SUBSIDIES ON THE COST OF LIVING

There has been, I fear, much misinformation, possibly misrepresentation, as to the effect that the discontinuance of the subsidy program would have upon the cost of living.

Witless Bill Green, president of the American Federation of Labor, has stated that the discontinuance of subsidies would cause food prices to be doubled in 3 months, and perhaps tripled in 6 months. This is so silly as to be unworthy of any serious attention.

Stabilization Czar Byrnes has stated that the discontinuance of subsidies of all kinds would increase the food level about 7 percent and the entire cost of living about 4 percent. I think Mr. Byrnes has statistical authority for this statement, but I question the correctness of his information.

My own investigation with the statistical bureaus has led me to believe that the entire discontinuance of the subsidy program would increase food costs about 3 or 4 percent, and would increase the entire cost of living about 1 percent. I realize that the estimate I am making, as well as the estimate made by Mr. Byrnes, is subject to review. I think, however, that my estimate is more nearly correct than that made by Mr. Byrnes.

Mr. President, I have had distributed to Members of the Senate nine tables which were prepared for me by the statistical agencies to which I have referred. I now wish to describe and discuss the tables as briefly as I can.

The tables which Senators have before them, identified by the letters A and B, were prepared for me by the Bureau of Labor Statistics in the Department of

Labor. The remaining tables, which are numbered from 1 to 7, inclusive, were prepared for me for use in this connection by the Bureau of Agricultural Economics. Both Bureaus have brought the facts as nearly up to date as it is possible to bring them.

Table A shows the cost of living from 1926 down to October 1943. In October 1943, the cost of living was 98.4 percent of what it was in 1926.

Table B breaks the cost of living down into the trend of prices on a number of important commodities. I especially invite attention, Mr. President, to the fact that when the average cost of living on November 15, 1943, was 98.2 percent of what it was in 1926, food was 99.9 percent—still less than 100 percent. But the price of clothing on November 15 had gone up to 110.3 percent. Household furnishings had gone to 106.5 percent.

I wish to add to table B further information which I obtained from the Bureau of Labor Statistics—namely, that the index price of bituminous coal on November 15 was 105.5 percent of the 1926 price. I make that statement because when the Bureau sent me the figures on fuel they combined coal, gas, and electricity. I asked the Bureau to separate the figures, which they did, but the figures came to me too late to be included among those shown in the table.

I should be glad if Senators would refer to table 1, because on that table there appears a tabulation of 16 articles of food on which the average retail prices from 1925 to 1929 are compared with those of October 1943. Mr. President, the table shows that in October 1943 the average prices of 8 of those articles was above the 1926 prices, and that as to the remaining 8, the average prices were below the 1926 prices. I did not select those articles. I telephoned the Bureau of Agricultural Economics and asked them to select 16 important food articles in order to show how the prices on the last available date compared with the prices for the same articles in 1926. This is the result of their work.

I believe the information shown on table 2 is self-explanatory. I invite attention to the fact that it shows food costs and consumer income. I invite attention to the fact that in column 4, where there is shown the amount of income remaining after purchasing food, the income is not only higher now than it was in 1926, but during the period about which so much disturbance has been raised, the period from 1940 to the present time, the consumer net income after his grocery bill was paid increased every month. In other words, net income has increased more than the cost of food. That statement applies not to industrial workers alone, but to the average citizen of the United States as a whole.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GILLETTE in the chair). Does the Senator from Kansas yield to the Senator from North Dakota?

Mr. REED. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. I wish the Senator would explain table 1.

Mr. REED. The figure 111.0 is shown at the bottom of column 5. That figure should not be there. The figures in column 6 on table 1, showing the prices of food, represent the proportion of the total food costs of that particular food item.

If the Senator will examine line 4, he will find that milk represented 8.6 percent of the total food costs of the average consumer of the United States. In line 9, he will find that white bread is 5.7 percent. Does that explanation make it clear?

Mr. LANGER. I thank the Senator very much.

Mr. REED. I invite attention of Senators to the fact that these tables are quite important. So far as I know, they have been prepared somewhat differently than similar tables have heretofore been prepared. They have been prepared by the two most prominent statistical bureaus in the United States, which were told exactly the purpose for which I wished to use them. They were prepared so that if I had spoken yesterday the release date on one of the statements would have prevented me from using it. The information is that recent.

I wish to refer now to table 3. I am trying to hurry along, Mr. President. I do not wish to detain the Senate unnecessarily. On page 3 is shown the increase in weekly earnings per worker in various classes of employment. I call special attention to line 20 of that table. The country now is confronted with the question of increasing the wages of railroad workers. Last week there was a resolution before the Senate dealing with that subject. Yesterday we had a threat of a railroad strike based on wages. I am expressing no opinion about the adequacy or inadequacy of railroad wages, but this table shows that from January 1, 1941, to July 1943, the wages of all employees of class 1 steam railroads increased 29.9 percent.

I invite special attention to the last 5 lines, namely, lines 25, 26, 27, 28, and 29. Mr. President, like other Senators, I occasionally read articles written by columnists, and sometimes I become a little irritated, though not so much so as do some of my senatorial friends. I realize that we have columnists with us. All I want them to do is to be as fair as possible, as reasonable as they can be, and also be accurate in their statements. Recently I read an article by Mr. Lippmann, in which he stated that the Government workers had received no increase in wages and that they were badly cramped by the rise in prices.

Of course, I read Mr. Lippmann occasionally. Sometimes I am impressed by his pontifical and ponderous style and sometimes I have difficulty in telling whether it is the voice of Lippmann or the voice of God. Anyway, God is usually more correct than is Mr. Lippmann.

On line 27 these figures show that 3,107,000 Government workers in the executive service received an increase of wages of 19.8 percent since January 1, 1941.

While I am dealing with the columnist question, Mr. President, I do not think we ought to take the columnists too seriously.

The Senate will remember what David Harum said about fleas and a dog, that he thought reasonable amounts of fleas were good for a dog; they kept him from brooding over the fact that he was a dog. So I think the nagging and irritation we get from some of the columnists is probably good for us, and maybe keep us from brooding over more important things. So we ought not to take them too seriously. There is the sensational and sometimes inaccurate Drew Pearson's voice of the White House, and then my good friend Ernest Lindley, whose father was chancellor of Kansas University. I could go further through the list, but I do not want to take the time away from the Senator from Michigan who has a measure which he thinks is much more important, I suppose.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, the Senator says we should not take these figures too seriously.

Mr. REED. No; I did not say the figures; I want them to be taken seriously. I said not to take the columnists too seriously.

Mr. WHERRY. Very well. If we are going to take them that way, the Senator's table B, if I caught it correctly, representing the index of the cost of 16 items of food is only 98.2 percent at this time, taking 1926 as a basis.

Mr. REED. In the case of food, it is 99.9, including all items.

Mr. WHERRY. Food, of course, is produced by farmers and other producers.

Mr. REED. And by stockmen.

Mr. WHERRY. Very well. That figure I think is outstanding, and I want to compliment the Senator in calling that table to the attention of the Senate, because now we have some idea of what the food cost rise has been.

Mr. REED. And some idea of the extent of the exaggeration, distortion, and misrepresentations that have been made to this country by this administration. That is what I am trying to put before the Senate and the country today. It is a disgraceful chapter in the governmental history of the United States.

Mr. WHERRY. I want to thank the Senator for the table and for his remarks, but I also want to call attention to the fact that in table No. 3 there is one item the Senator apparently did not mention, although he mentioned others. That table shows that farm labor has increased 110 percent. That goes into the cost of production of food, and the cost of food has increased only 99 percent. Certainly, the farmer's cost has gone up tremendously above any other prices. Is that correct?

Mr. REED. The Senator is correct. I may say to the Senator from Nebraska that I did not take more time on these tables because, although they are important, I did not want the Senator from Michigan to have nervous prostration.

Mr. WHERRY. We will take care of the Senator from Michigan if the Senator will continue to bring to our attention tables such as these, which are so informative.

Mr. REED. I think table 3 is important. There has been much said

about the white-collar workers, and there is much to be said for the white-collar workers. However, I think white-collar workers have not been entirely neglected inasmuch as they have had an increase in pay almost equivalent to the increase in the cost of living.

Table 4 is merely a reduction of industrial wages paid to their real worth, compared, for example, with 1924 to 1929, which is taken as 100. The wages of industrial workers, according to the last figure we have, is 163 percent of the average from 1924 to 1929. The cost of living is 99 percent of that average. The real worth of these wages is 165 percent of the wages paid in 1926; so the increase in real worth, in purchasing power, is 65 percent.

Table 5 is a compilation such as I have used in nearly similar form several times previously on this floor. It shows the relation between factory wages, the average hourly earnings, and the urban cost of living, and the real wages of workers. It shows about the same result as the other table, except that the period 1935 to 1939 is used as a basis. Using that as the basis, since the 1st day of January 1939, in the period about which the present administration broadcasts so much as to the increase in the cost of living, because of which it threatens to surrender to minorities that insist upon more concessions, the real earnings per worker have increased to 159.7 percent of the base period—an increase in purchasing power of 59.7 per cent.

Taking the hourly wage, which has not increased as much as the actual wage, because of longer hours and overtime payments, but taking the hourly wage as the basis the increase in the real purchasing power of the wage is 29.3 percent. The last figure shows 129.3 percent as compared with the 1st of January 1939.

Table 6 compares the income of the farmer, the person engaged in agriculture, with the income of the industrial worker. That is the best comparison we can make. Back in 1910 to 1914, the period which we used so long as the basis of parity, the farmer got 62 percent, as much of an income as the industrial worker. The best years the farmer ever had was 1917, when he got 84 percent as much as the industrial worker, 1918 when he got 82.9 percent as much, and 1919 when he got 81.6 percent as much. In 1932, at the depth of the depression, the farmer's income had decreased so far and the prices of the farmers' products had gone so low that in that year the farmer got 23.5 percent as much of an income as the average industrial worker. In 1943 the farmer had 65 percent as much income as the industrial worker.

I go now, Mr. President, to page 7, and then I shall conclude.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado in the chair). Does the Senator from Kansas yield to the Senator from Indiana?

Mr. REED. I yield.

Mr. WILLIS. Do the tables furnish information as to the increase in wages and cost of living since September 1942, the date of the hold-the-line order?

Mr. REED. I am sorry I have not that figure in exactly that shape. There had been some increase in wages and some increase in the cost of living up to the early summer or late spring months of this year, since which time there has been some decrease in the cost of living; but I do not have those figures.

Mr. President, I wish to make an important observation, based on table 7, which was prepared by the Bureau of Agricultural Economics. I shall make this as brief as I can, but it is important.

This administration is greatly worried about subsidies, and is insisting upon the payment of subsidies so as to reduce food costs to the consumer. From 1921 to 1940 the food producers of this country, the farmers and the stockmen, subsidized food consumers to the extent of \$17,767,000,000. Senators will find that on line 26 of table 7.

In the last 3 years, beginning in 1941 and running through 1942 and 1943, the farmer has improved his position both actually, and relatively as to the other population. The farmer has pulled himself up in this period to the extent of \$7,106,000,000. That will be found in line 37.

From 1924 to 1940 the farmer's property decreased in value, because he was producing at a loss, and his capital actually shrank in those years over \$11,000,000,000. So that the total shrinkage in value of the farmer's property, plus his deficiency in income, amounted to \$31,454,000,000.

The fact is that in those years the farmer was subsidizing the food consumer. He was selling his products at less than they cost him to produce, and his income, taking into account the shrinkage in capital values, was \$31,000,000,000 short in that period.

Nineteen hundred and forty-three has been the best year, perhaps, agriculture ever had, save possibly the First World War years of 1917, 1918, and 1919. I think 1943 was the best year agriculture ever will have. I should like to talk about that at some length, but I think I shall be able to restrain myself, and save that for a later date.

Mr. HAWKES. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado in the chair). Does the Senator from Kansas yield to the Senator from New Jersey?

Mr. REED. I yield.

Mr. HAWKES. Before the Senator from Kansas takes his seat I should like to ask him one question. Has he found any way of reconciling the two statements coming from the administration, first, that workers and most other citizens of the United States are earning so much money that some way must be found to siphon it off in order to stop inflation; and second, that we must have the subsidies now requested in order that the people may eat?

Both the Senator and I have very deep sympathy with those who have fixed incomes; we have very deep sympathy and full understanding of their problems. I refer to those who have had no advances in income, or little advances, the so-called white-collar workers, stenogra-

phers, teachers, and various other classes, who, according to what I understood the Senator to say, he estimates comprise about 18 or 20 percent of our population.

Mr. REED. No; about one-eighth.

Mr. HAWKES. I cannot bring together the two thoughts emanating from the administration, one that there is so much money in the pockets of the people that it must be taken away in order to stop inflation, and, second, that we must continue a program of Government subsidization, when all of us know that one subsidy leads to another, and the last one to another, and that the entire system of subsidy is destructive of the American system of free enterprise and the American way of life. Can the Senator throw any light on that subject?

Mr. REED. Not very much. As a matter of fact, anyone with a fixed income is better off when prices are low, and as prices rise, if his income is still fixed, the fixed-income citizen is in greater difficulty. I agree with the Senator from New Jersey, the use of subsidies, in the way that subsidies have been used, is as uneconomical a practice as can possibly be followed. At the present time our citizens are receiving the highest average incomes ever received in the history of the United States. The industrial workers, who are putting most of the pressure behind the increase-in-wage cry, and threatening now to "break the line," are receiving the highest wages paid in the history of the world. Yet, with the present subsidies paid, they buy their groceries at lower prices and have more money left with which to break the line, than if they had to pay what their food is reasonably and fairly worth in the market at this time.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may have the tables to which I have referred, and which I have described, inserted in the RECORD at this point.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the tables were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TABLE A.—Comparison of changes in wholesale prices and in wage earners' cost of living

[Indexes 1926=100]

| Date | Wholesale prices (in primary markets) | Cost of living |
|-----------|---------------------------------------|----------------|
| Average: | | |
| 1926..... | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| 1927..... | 95.4 | 98.1 |
| 1928..... | 96.7 | 97.0 |
| 1929..... | 95.3 | 96.9 |
| 1930..... | 86.4 | 94.5 |
| 1931..... | 73.0 | 86.0 |
| 1932..... | 64.8 | 77.2 |
| 1933..... | 65.9 | 73.1 |
| 1934..... | 74.9 | 75.7 |
| 1935..... | 80.0 | 77.6 |
| 1936..... | 80.8 | 78.4 |
| 1937..... | 86.3 | 81.2 |
| 1938..... | 78.6 | 79.7 |
| 1939..... | 77.1 | 78.6 |
| 1940..... | 78.6 | 79.3 |
| 1941..... | 87.3 | 83.2 |
| 1942..... | 98.8 | 92.2 |

TABLE A.—Comparison of changes in whole-sale prices and in wage earners' cost of living—Continued

| [Indexes 1926=100] | | |
|--------------------|--|----------------|
| Date | Whole-sale prices (in primary markets) | Cost of living |
| 1942—January..... | 96.0 | 88.6 |
| February..... | 96.7 | 89.3 |
| March..... | 97.6 | 90.4 |
| April..... | 98.7 | 91.1 |
| May..... | 98.8 | 91.8 |
| June..... | 98.6 | 92.1 |
| July..... | 98.7 | 92.6 |
| August..... | 99.2 | 93.0 |
| September..... | 99.6 | 93.2 |
| October..... | 100.0 | 94.1 |
| November..... | 100.3 | 94.8 |
| December..... | 101.0 | 95.3 |
| 1943—January..... | 101.9 | 95.5 |
| February..... | 102.5 | 95.7 |
| March..... | 103.4 | 97.2 |
| April..... | 103.7 | 98.2 |
| May..... | 104.1 | 99.0 |
| June..... | 103.8 | 98.7 |
| July..... | 103.2 | 98.0 |
| August..... | 103.1 | 97.6 |
| September..... | *103.1 | 98.0 |
| October..... | *103.0 | 98.4 |

Source: U. S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics.

The cost-of-living index measures changes in the cost of goods purchased by wage earners and lower-salaried workers due to changes in retail prices; that is, it is a price barometer, not a measure of total family expenditures, since total family expenditures also are affected by changes in income.

TABLE B.—Indexes of the cost of living to moderate-income families in the large cities combined

| [Average 1926=100] | | | | | | |
|--------------------|-----------|-------|----------|-------|-------------------|---------------|
| Date | All items | Food | Clothing | Rent | Housing—utilities | Miscellaneous |
| Average: | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| 1926..... | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| 1927..... | 98.1 | 96.3 | 98.1 | 98.4 | 97.6 | 100.6 |
| 1928..... | 97.0 | 95.2 | 96.6 | 96.1 | 95.2 | 101.2 |
| 1929..... | 96.9 | 96.4 | 95.6 | 93.8 | 94.0 | 101.9 |
| 1930..... | 94.5 | 91.7 | 93.4 | 91.2 | 91.7 | 102.4 |
| 1931..... | 86.0 | 75.6 | 85.1 | 86.5 | 82.5 | 101.5 |
| 1932..... | 77.2 | 63.0 | 75.3 | 77.6 | 71.9 | 99.1 |
| 1933..... | 73.1 | 61.2 | 72.9 | 66.8 | 70.9 | 95.9 |
| 1934..... | 75.7 | 68.2 | 79.7 | 62.6 | 78.1 | 95.4 |
| 1935..... | 77.6 | 73.1 | 80.3 | 62.5 | 79.8 | 95.6 |
| 1936..... | 78.4 | 73.7 | 80.9 | 64.0 | 81.1 | 96.2 |
| 1937..... | 81.2 | 76.6 | 85.2 | 67.0 | 87.8 | 98.4 |
| 1938..... | 79.7 | 71.2 | 84.7 | 69.1 | 87.0 | 98.9 |
| 1939..... | 78.6 | 69.3 | 83.3 | 69.2 | 85.3 | 98.1 |
| 1940..... | 79.3 | 70.3 | 84.3 | 69.4 | 84.6 | 98.6 |
| 1941..... | 83.2 | 76.8 | 88.1 | 70.5 | 90.3 | 101.4 |
| 1942..... | 92.2 | 90.2 | 103.0 | 72.0 | 102.9 | 108.1 |
| 1943: Nov. 15..... | 98.2 | 99.9 | 110.3 | 71.7 | 106.5 | 114.7 |

¹ Rent figures collected quarterly only. This index as of Sept. 15, 1943.

Source: U. S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics.

TABLE 1.—Retail prices of 16 major foods in leading cities of the United States, average 1925-29 and October 1943

| Commodity | Unit | Retail price | | | |
|-------------------------------------|----------------|-------------------|--------------|--|--|
| | | 1925-29, Octobers | October 1943 | October 1943 as percent of October 1925-29 | Percent of total food, October 1943 ¹ |
| (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | (5) | (6) |
| Potatoes, white..... | 15 pounds..... | Cts. 50.4 | Cts. 61.0 | Pct. 121.0 | 4.1 |
| Flour, wheat..... | 10 pounds..... | 54.8 | 62.6 | 114.2 | 1.8 |
| Chickens, roasting..... | Pound..... | 38.7 | 44.1 | 114.0 | 5.6 |
| Milk, delivered ² | Quart..... | 14.2 | 15.5 | 109.2 | 8.6 |
| Eggs..... | Dozen..... | 61.9 | 67.2 | 108.6 | 8.1 |
| Cabbage..... | Pound..... | 4.3 | 4.6 | 107.0 | .5 |
| Tomatoes, canned ² | No. 2 can..... | 12.1 | 12.4 | 102.5 | 1.1 |
| Round steak ² | Pound..... | 41.4 | 41.9 | 101.2 | 2.6 |

See footnotes at end of table.

TABLE 1.—Retail prices of 16 major foods in leading cities of the United States, average 1925-29 and October 1943—Continued

| Commodity | Unit | Retail price | | | |
|--------------------------------------|---------------|-------------------|--------------|--|-------------------------------------|
| | | 1925-29, Octobers | October 1943 | October 1943 as percent of October 1925-29 | Percent of total food, October 1943 |
| (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | (5) | (6) |
| Bread, white..... | Pound..... | Cts. 9.1 | Cts. 8.9 | Pct. 97.8 | 5.7 |
| Rolls, white..... | Pound..... | 9.0 | 8.7 | 96.7 | .5 |
| Pork chops ² | Pound..... | 40.6 | 37.7 | 92.9 | 3.0 |
| Navy beans, dried ² | Pound..... | 11.1 | 10.3 | 92.8 | .4 |
| Lard ² | Pound..... | 20.5 | 18.9 | 92.2 | 1.3 |
| Butter ² | Pound..... | 57.2 | 50.5 | 88.3 | 4.2 |
| Oranges..... | Dozen..... | 59.0 | 51.8 | 87.8 | 5.9 |
| Corn flakes..... | 8 ounces..... | 9.8 | 6.6 | 67.3 | 1.1 |
| Total or average..... | | | | 111.0 | 54.4 |

¹ Based on aggregate consumer expenditures.

² Subsidy payments are being made to processors or producers.

Source: Division of Statistical and Historical Research, Bureau of Agricultural Economics. Compiled from publications of the Bureau of Labor Statistics.

TABLE 2.—Per capita food costs, consumer income, and expenditures, United States, 1929 to July 1943¹

| Year and month | Total income payments per capita ² | Expenditures for food ³ | "Take home" income after paying grocery bill ⁴ | Food expenditures as percentage of income | |
|----------------|---|------------------------------------|---|---|--|
| | | | | Actual | Cost of quantities of foods representing average annual consumption 1935-39 ⁵ |
| (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | (5) | (6) |
| 1929..... | \$679 | \$156 | \$523 | Pct. 23 | Pct. 22 |
| 1930..... | 595 | 143 | 452 | 24 | 23 |
| 1931..... | 500 | 120 | 380 | 24 | 22 |
| 1932..... | 380 | 94 | 286 | 25 | 24 |
| 1933..... | 368 | 91 | 277 | 25 | 25 |
| 1934..... | 418 | 100 | 318 | 24 | 25 |
| 1935..... | 460 | 105 | 355 | 23 | 25 |
| 1936..... | 531 | 113 | 418 | 21 | 22 |
| 1937..... | 561 | 119 | 442 | 21 | 21 |
| 1938..... | 509 | 113 | 396 | 22 | 21 |
| 1939..... | 541 | 114 | 427 | 21 | 20 |
| 1940..... | 579 | 121 | 458 | 21 | 18 |
| 1941..... | 692 | 140 | 552 | 20 | 17 |
| 1942..... | 857 | 176 | 681 | 21 | 17 |
| January..... | 777 | 168 | 609 | 22 | 17 |
| February..... | 786 | 160 | 626 | 20 | 17 |
| March..... | 793 | 162 | 634 | 20 | 17 |
| April..... | 817 | 165 | 652 | 20 | 17 |
| May..... | 826 | 171 | 655 | 21 | 17 |
| June..... | 846 | 169 | 677 | 20 | 17 |
| July..... | 861 | 179 | 682 | 21 | 17 |
| August..... | 877 | 182 | 695 | 21 | 17 |
| September..... | 887 | 178 | 709 | 20 | 16 |
| October..... | 909 | 196 | 713 | 22 | 16 |
| November..... | 939 | 184 | 755 | 20 | 16 |
| December..... | 959 | 193 | 766 | 20 | 16 |
| 1943: | | | | | |
| January..... | 973 | 194 | 779 | 20 | 16 |
| February..... | 991 | 198 | 793 | 20 | 16 |
| March..... | 1,009 | 207 | 802 | 21 | 16 |
| April..... | 1,023 | 194 | 829 | 19 | 16 |
| May..... | 1,028 | 201 | 827 | 20 | 16 |
| June..... | 1,040 | 200 | 840 | 19 | 16 |
| July..... | 1,052 | 212 | 840 | 20 | 16 |

¹ Averages apply to the average civilian consumer, including both farm and nonfarm population.

² Income and expenditure data are based upon compilations of the U. S. Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce.

³ Percentage of income required to purchase the same quantities of the same foods as the pre-war (1935-39) average consumption. Differences between this column and actual expenditures are due to changes in the nature and level of consumption, i. e., quality of food purchased, amount of services included, percentage of meals eaten out, etc.

Source: Division of Statistical and Historical Research, Bureau of Agricultural Economics.

TABLE 3.—Increase in weekly earnings per worker in selected industries compared with increase in cost of living, United States, January 1941 to July 1943

| Industry | Wage earners employed July 1943 | Weekly earnings | | Percentage increase |
|--|---------------------------------|-----------------|-------------|---------------------|
| | | January 1941 | July 1943 | |
| (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | (5) |
| Water transportation..... | 80 | Thou- 40.76 | Dol- 177.76 | Pct. 90.8 |
| Shipbuilding..... | (2) | 37.69 | 60.62 | 60.8 |
| Anthracite mining..... | 71 | 25.13 | 39.69 | 57.9 |
| Automobiles..... | 694 | 37.69 | 57.18 | 52.1 |
| Iron and steel..... | 1,711 | 31.07 | 47.27 | 52.1 |
| Bituminous mining..... | 379 | 25.00 | 42.70 | 64.5 |
| Rubber products..... | 192 | 30.38 | 45.00 | 48.1 |
| Quarrying and nonmetallic mining..... | 63 | 22.06 | 35.72 | 61.9 |
| Chemicals and allied products..... | 742 | 27.53 | 42.04 | 52.7 |
| Metaliferous mining..... | 95 | 30.31 | 43.30 | 42.9 |
| Crude petroleum and natural gas..... | 93 | 33.99 | 49.51 | 45.7 |
| Stone, clay, and glass products..... | 358 | 25.02 | 35.40 | 41.5 |
| Textile mill products..... | 1,219 | 18.01 | 27.16 | 50.8 |
| Street railways and busses..... | 229 | 33.63 | 44.30 | 31.7 |
| Food and kindred products..... | 1,016 | 24.69 | 35.52 | 43.9 |
| Leather and leather products..... | 330 | 20.66 | 29.13 | 41.0 |
| Dyeing and cleaning..... | 85 | 19.92 | 27.55 | 38.3 |
| Apparel and other finished textile products..... | 833 | 18.76 | 26.05 | 38.9 |
| Farm labor (hired) ³ | 2,986 | 9.54 | 20.04 | 110.1 |
| Class I steam railways..... | 1,539 | 32.93 | 42.79 | 29.9 |
| Tobacco manufacturers..... | 89 | 17.89 | 27.37 | 53.0 |
| Electric light and power..... | 209 | 35.49 | 44.86 | 26.4 |
| Power laundries..... | 268 | 18.37 | 23.47 | 27.8 |
| Year-round hotels..... | 346 | 15.65 | 20.18 | 28.9 |
| Wholesale trade..... | 1,499 | 30.59 | 39.44 | 28.9 |
| Retail trade..... | 3,627 | 21.53 | 25.48 | 18.3 |
| U. S. Government executive service..... | 3,107 | 35.54 | 42.58 | 19.8 |
| Printing and publishing..... | 339 | 33.49 | 40.02 | 19.5 |
| Telephone and telegraph..... | 490 | 31.69 | 35.94 | 13.4 |
| Cost of living..... | | | | 22.8 |

¹ Based on pay rolls and employment indexes as reported by Bureau of Labor Statistics Monthly Pay Rolls (including bonuses for entering war zones) divided by employment and then divided by 4.33 to arrive at a weekly wage figure.

² Restricted.

³ Wage rate per day without board multiplied by 6 to obtain weekly figures.

⁴ Based on data reported by Interstate Commerce Commission.

⁵ Estimate made by Bureau of Agricultural Economics by dividing pay rolls of class I steam railway employees who received pay during the month (excluding salaried employees and switching and terminal companies) by employment of class I steam railways and then dividing by 4.33 to arrive at a weekly wage. All data employed in making this estimate were reported by Interstate Commerce Commission.

⁶ Estimated by Bureau of Agricultural Economics. Data of employment and pay rolls as reported by the Interstate Commerce Commission not yet available.

⁷ Board, room, and tips are not included in the wages of hotel employees.

⁸ Based on employment and pay-roll data furnished by Bureau of Labor Statistics. Monthly pay rolls divided by 4.33 to convert to a weekly basis.

Source: Division of Statistical and Historical Research, Bureau of Agricultural Economics.

TABLE 4.—Income of industrial workers adjusted for living costs, United States, 1941-43

| [1924-29=100] | | | |
|---------------|------------------------------|-----------------------------|--|
| Year | Income per industrial worker | Cost of living ¹ | Income per industrial worker adjusted for cost of living |
| (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) |
| 1935-39..... | 88 | 81 | 109 |
| 1940..... | 97 | 81 | 120 |
| 1941..... | 114 | 85 | 134 |
| 1942..... | 141 | 94 | 150 |
| 1943..... | 163 | 99 | 165 |

¹ Bureau of Labor Statistics data converted to 1924-29 base.

Source: Bureau of Agricultural Economics.

TABLE 5.—Percentage index of average earnings per employed worker and per hour in manufacturing and urban living costs, United States, 1939-43

(1935-39=100)

| Year and month | Factory pay roll per employed worker ¹ | Average hourly earnings of factory workers ² | Urban cost of living ³ | Real earnings | |
|----------------|---|---|-----------------------------------|---------------|----------|
| | | | | Per worker | Per hour |
| (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | (5) | (6) |
| 1939: | | | | | |
| January..... | 101.5 | 104.3 | 99.7 | 101.8 | 104.6 |
| February..... | 102.7 | 104.2 | 99.3 | 103.4 | 104.9 |
| March..... | 103.7 | 104.3 | 99.1 | 104.6 | 105.2 |
| April..... | 101.3 | 104.0 | 99.0 | 102.3 | 105.1 |
| May..... | 101.8 | 104.3 | 98.9 | 102.9 | 105.5 |
| June..... | 103.4 | 104.2 | 98.6 | 104.9 | 105.7 |
| July..... | 100.7 | 103.3 | 99.1 | 101.6 | 104.2 |
| August..... | 103.8 | 103.0 | 98.7 | 105.2 | 104.4 |
| September..... | 103.7 | 103.7 | 100.6 | 103.2 | 103.1 |
| October..... | 108.8 | 104.8 | 100.4 | 108.4 | 104.4 |
| November..... | 108.5 | 106.0 | 100.2 | 108.3 | 105.8 |
| December..... | 110.6 | 107.6 | 99.6 | 111.0 | 108.0 |
| 1940: | | | | | |
| January..... | 107.7 | 108.1 | 99.7 | 108.0 | 108.4 |
| February..... | 107.3 | 108.0 | 100.2 | 107.1 | 107.8 |
| March..... | 108.5 | 108.5 | 99.8 | 108.7 | 108.7 |
| April..... | 107.5 | 108.3 | 100.0 | 107.5 | 108.3 |
| May..... | 108.2 | 108.9 | 100.2 | 108.0 | 108.7 |
| June..... | 109.5 | 109.3 | 100.5 | 109.0 | 108.8 |
| July..... | 107.9 | 108.6 | 100.3 | 107.6 | 108.3 |
| August..... | 111.4 | 108.9 | 100.0 | 111.4 | 108.9 |
| September..... | 113.6 | 109.4 | 100.4 | 113.1 | 109.0 |
| October..... | 115.4 | 109.8 | 100.2 | 115.2 | 109.6 |
| November..... | 114.7 | 110.8 | 100.1 | 114.6 | 110.7 |
| December..... | 119.2 | 111.6 | 100.7 | 118.4 | 110.8 |
| 1941: | | | | | |
| January..... | 118.4 | 112.7 | 100.8 | 117.5 | 111.8 |
| February..... | 122.0 | 113.1 | 100.8 | 121.0 | 112.2 |
| March..... | 124.0 | 113.7 | 101.2 | 122.5 | 112.4 |
| April..... | 124.6 | 115.9 | 102.2 | 121.9 | 113.4 |
| May..... | 130.9 | 119.0 | 102.9 | 127.2 | 115.6 |
| June..... | 134.8 | 120.8 | 104.6 | 128.9 | 115.5 |
| July..... | 132.5 | 121.3 | 105.3 | 125.8 | 115.2 |
| August..... | 134.8 | 121.5 | 106.2 | 126.9 | 114.4 |
| September..... | 136.6 | 123.5 | 108.1 | 126.4 | 114.2 |
| October..... | 140.0 | 125.6 | 109.4 | 128.0 | 114.8 |
| November..... | 139.3 | 127.6 | 110.2 | 126.4 | 115.8 |
| December..... | 144.3 | 129.2 | 110.5 | 130.6 | 116.9 |
| 1942: | | | | | |
| January..... | 149.8 | 132.2 | 112.0 | 133.8 | 118.0 |
| February..... | 152.7 | 132.6 | 112.9 | 135.2 | 117.4 |
| March..... | 155.6 | 133.9 | 114.3 | 136.1 | 117.1 |
| April..... | 158.0 | 135.7 | 115.1 | 137.3 | 117.9 |
| May..... | 161.2 | 137.8 | 116.0 | 139.0 | 118.8 |
| June..... | 163.2 | 139.5 | 116.4 | 140.2 | 119.8 |
| July..... | 165.0 | 141.3 | 117.0 | 141.0 | 120.8 |
| August..... | 169.3 | 143.6 | 117.5 | 144.1 | 122.2 |
| September..... | 171.2 | 147.2 | 117.8 | 145.3 | 125.0 |
| October..... | 176.0 | 147.4 | 119.0 | 147.9 | 123.9 |

See footnotes at end of table.

TABLE 5.—Percentage index of average earnings per employed worker and per hour in manufacturing and urban living costs, United States, 1939-43—Continued

| Year and month | Factory pay roll per employed worker | Average hourly earnings of factory workers | Urban cost of living | Real earnings | |
|----------------|--------------------------------------|--|----------------------|---------------|----------|
| | | | | Per worker | Per hour |
| (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | (5) | (6) |
| 1942—Contd. | | | | | |
| November..... | 180.8 | 149.4 | 119.8 | 150.9 | 124.7 |
| December..... | 182.6 | 149.7 | 120.4 | 151.7 | 124.3 |
| 1943: | | | | | |
| January..... | 184.0 | 151.7 | 120.7 | 152.4 | 125.7 |
| February..... | 186.7 | 152.5 | 121.0 | 154.3 | 126.0 |
| March..... | 189.9 | 154.2 | 122.8 | 154.6 | 125.6 |
| April..... | 192.7 | 155.8 | 124.1 | 155.3 | 125.5 |
| May..... | 195.7 | 157.5 | 125.1 | 156.4 | 125.9 |
| June..... | 196.1 | 158.3 | 124.8 | 157.1 | 126.8 |
| July..... | 193.9 | 159.0 | 123.8 | 156.6 | 128.4 |
| August..... | 196.8 | 159.3 | 123.2 | 159.7 | 129.3 |

¹ The index of factory pay rolls divided by that of factory employment.² Based on cents-per-hour data reported by the Bureau of Labor Statistics.³ Bureau of Labor Statistics data.

Source: Bureau of Agricultural Economics.

TABLE 6.—Average hourly earnings and annual wage income of factory and industrial workers compared to average net farm income of persons engaged in agriculture, 1910-43

| Year | Hourly earnings of factory workers | | Wage income per industrial worker | | Average net farm income per person engaged in agriculture ² | Column 6 as percent of column 4 |
|-----------|------------------------------------|-------------|-----------------------------------|-------------|--|---------------------------------|
| | Per hour ¹ | 1910-14=100 | Per year | 1910-14=100 | | |
| (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | (5) | (6) | (7) |
| 1910..... | Cents | Per cent | | Per cent | Per cent | |
| 1911..... | 20.0 | 94.4 | \$573 | 98.4 | \$371 | 64.7 |
| 1912..... | 20.4 | 96.4 | 562 | 96.5 | 348 | 61.9 |
| 1913..... | 21.2 | 100.1 | 575 | 98.7 | 371 | 64.5 |

See footnotes at end of table.

TABLE 6.—Average hourly earnings and annual wage income of factory and industrial workers compared to average net farm income of persons engaged in agriculture, 1910-43—Continued

| Year | Hourly earnings of factory workers | | Wage income per industrial worker | | Average net farm income per person engaged in agriculture | Column 6 as percent of column 4 |
|--------------|------------------------------------|-------------|-----------------------------------|-------------|---|---------------------------------|
| | Per hour | 1910-14=100 | Per year | 1910-14=100 | | |
| (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | (5) | (6) | (7) |
| 1913..... | Cents | Per cent | | Per cent | Per cent | |
| 1914..... | 22.0 | 103.8 | \$600 | 103.0 | \$382 | 63.7 |
| 1915..... | 22.3 | 105.3 | 603 | 103.5 | 370 | 59.7 |
| 1916..... | 22.9 | 108.1 | 622 | 106.8 | 381 | 61.3 |
| 1917..... | 26.1 | 123.3 | 694 | 119.1 | 465 | 67.0 |
| 1918..... | 31.1 | 146.7 | 818 | 140.4 | 690 | 84.4 |
| 1919..... | 40.8 | 192.5 | 1,064 | 182.6 | 882 | 82.9 |
| 1920..... | 47.7 | 225.1 | 1,188 | 203.9 | 969 | 81.6 |
| 1921..... | 57.8 | 273.2 | 1,411 | 242.2 | 753 | 53.4 |
| 1922..... | 50.6 | 238.8 | 1,234 | 211.8 | 417 | 33.8 |
| 1923..... | 46.4 | 219.1 | 1,182 | 202.9 | 453 | 38.3 |
| 1924..... | 52.0 | 245.4 | 1,274 | 218.7 | 532 | 41.8 |
| 1925..... | 54.5 | 257.4 | 1,273 | 218.5 | 559 | 43.9 |
| 1926..... | 54.4 | 256.9 | 1,293 | 221.9 | 642 | 49.7 |
| 1927..... | 54.8 | 258.9 | 1,318 | 226.2 | 609 | 46.2 |
| 1928..... | 55.2 | 260.6 | 1,311 | 225.0 | 621 | 47.4 |
| 1929..... | 56.0 | 264.3 | 1,323 | 227.1 | 616 | 46.6 |
| 1930..... | 56.6 | 267.2 | 1,334 | 229.0 | 649 | 48.7 |
| 1931..... | 55.2 | 260.6 | 1,249 | 214.4 | 489 | 39.2 |
| 1932..... | 51.7 | 244.0 | 1,130 | 194.0 | 322 | 28.5 |
| 1933..... | 45.8 | 216.2 | 929 | 159.5 | 218 | 23.5 |
| 1934..... | 45.5 | 214.8 | 900 | 154.5 | 289 | 32.1 |
| 1935..... | 54.1 | 255.4 | 983 | 168.7 | 400 | 40.7 |
| 1936..... | 55.9 | 264.0 | 1,058 | 181.6 | 448 | 44.2 |
| 1937..... | 56.4 | 266.3 | 1,130 | 194.0 | 536 | 47.4 |
| 1938..... | 63.4 | 299.5 | 1,219 | 209.2 | 565 | 46.3 |
| 1939..... | 63.9 | 301.8 | 1,134 | 194.6 | 489 | 43.1 |
| 1940..... | 63.3 | 298.9 | 1,205 | 206.8 | 504 | 41.8 |
| 1941..... | 66.1 | 312.1 | 1,273 | 218.5 | 526 | 41.3 |
| 1942..... | 72.9 | 344.1 | 1,495 | 256.6 | 726 | 48.6 |
| 1943..... | 85.3 | 402.7 | 1,847 | 317.0 | 1,062 | 57.5 |
| Averages: | | | 2,138 | 367.0 | 1,392 | 65.1 |
| 1910-14..... | 21.2 | 100.0 | 583 | 100.0 | 366 | 62.8 |
| 1935-39..... | 60.6 | 286.1 | 1,149 | 197.2 | 512 | 44.6 |

¹ 1939 to date, not comparable to earlier date.² Aggregate net income of farm operators (excluding value of inventory changes) plus wages of hired laborers divided by average farm employment. Including Government payments.³ Preliminary estimate.

Source: Bureau of Agricultural Economics.

TABLE 7.—Operating deficit under "parity income," 1921-40, and decrease in farmer's equity, 1924-40

[In millions of dollars]

| Year | Parity income and actual income from agriculture to persons on farms, United States 1921-40 | | Value of farm property, Jan. 1 | | | Total farm debt | Farmers' equity |
|--|---|---------------|--------------------------------|--------|--------|-----------------|-----------------|
| | Parity income | Actual income | Real Estate | Other | Total | | |
| (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | (5) | (6) | (7) | (8) |
| 1921..... | 6,289 | 3,795 | (1) | (1) | (1) | (1) | (1) |
| 1922..... | 6,255 | 4,850 | (1) | (1) | (1) | (1) | (1) |
| 1923..... | 6,973 | 5,608 | (1) | (1) | (1) | (1) | (1) |
| 1924..... | 6,687 | 5,560 | 50,468 | 8,857 | 59,325 | 13,506 | 45,819 |
| 1925..... | 6,875 | 6,866 | 49,468 | 8,841 | 58,309 | 12,677 | 45,632 |
| 1926..... | 7,226 | 6,617 | 49,052 | 9,296 | 58,348 | 12,440 | 45,908 |
| 1927..... | 6,788 | 6,314 | 47,634 | 9,338 | 56,972 | 12,269 | 44,703 |
| 1928..... | 6,883 | 6,687 | 47,495 | 9,912 | 57,407 | 12,363 | 45,044 |
| 1929..... | 7,253 | 6,741 | 47,880 | 10,588 | 58,468 | 12,363 | 46,105 |
| 1930..... | 6,335 | 5,114 | 47,880 | 10,498 | 58,378 | 12,019 | 46,359 |
| Total for period..... | 67,564 | 58,152 | | | | | |
| Deficit in farm income under parity income for period 1921-30..... | | 9,412 | | | | | |
| 1931..... | 5,093 | 3,482 | 43,993 | 8,382 | 52,375 | 11,500 | 40,875 |
| 1932..... | 3,778 | 2,285 | 37,236 | 6,647 | 43,883 | 10,842 | 33,041 |
| 1933..... | 3,645 | 2,982 | 30,724 | 5,554 | 36,278 | 9,963 | 26,315 |
| 1934..... | 4,257 | 3,515 | 31,933 | 5,685 | 37,618 | 9,154 | 28,464 |
| 1935..... | 4,738 | 5,037 | 32,859 | 5,879 | 38,738 | 8,935 | 29,803 |
| 1936..... | 5,393 | 5,340 | 33,910 | 7,782 | 41,692 | 8,771 | 32,921 |
| 1937..... | 5,707 | 6,074 | 34,757 | 7,951 | 42,708 | 8,628 | 34,080 |
| 1938..... | 5,216 | 4,996 | 34,747 | 8,328 | 43,075 | 8,741 | 34,334 |

See footnotes at end of table.

TABLE 7.—Operating deficit under "parity income," 1921-40, and decrease in farmer's equity, 1924-40—Continued

| Year (1) | Parity income and actual income from agriculture to persons on farms, United States 1921-40 | | Value of farm property, Jan. 1 | | | Total farm debt (7) | Farmers' equity (8) |
|--|---|----------------------|--------------------------------|--------------|--------------|------------------------|------------------------|
| | Parity income (2) | Actual income (3) | Real Estate (4) | Other (5) | Total (6) | | |
| 1939..... | 4,485 | 5,174 | 33,931 | 8,407 | 42,338 | 9,025 | 33,313 |
| 1940..... | 5,956 | 5,386 | 33,642 | 8,504 | 42,146 | 8,929 | 33,217 |
| Total for period..... | 49,268 | 44,271 | | | | | |
| Income less Government payments..... | | 40,913 | | | | | |
| Deficit in farm income under parity income for period 1931-40..... | | 8,355 | | | | | |
| Total deficit in farm income under parity income 1921-40..... | | 17,767 | | | | | ² 12,606 |

¹ 1921-23 not included because of the inflated land values in that period which distort the picture.² Net decrease in farmers' equity 1924-40.

IMPROVEMENT IN FARMERS' SITUATION SINCE 1940

| | | | | | | | |
|---|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|-------|---------------------|
| 1941..... | 6,808 | 7,591 | 34,026 | 8,903 | 42,929 | 9,073 | 33,856 |
| 1942..... | 8,192 | 11,288 | 36,611 | 11,464 | 48,075 | 9,150 | 38,925 |
| 1943..... | 9,348 | 14,200 | 39,905 | 14,696 | 54,601 | 8,837 | 45,764 |
| Total for period..... | 24,348 | 33,079 | | | | | |
| Income less Government payments..... | | 31,451 | | | | | |
| Increase farm income over parity income, 1941-43..... | | 7,106 | | | | | ² 11,908 |

Million dollars

| | |
|--|--------|
| Total income deficit, 1921-40..... | 17,767 |
| Net increase in farmers' equity in farm property, 1924-40..... | 12,606 |
| Total accrued farm deficit, 1921-40..... | 30,373 |
| Improvement since 1940: | |
| Increase farm income over parity income, 1941-43..... | 7,106 |
| Net increase in farm property equity, 1941-43..... | 11,908 |
| Total improvement since 1940..... | 19,014 |
| Net deficiency in farm income plus net decrease in farmers' equity, 1921-43..... | 11,359 |

¹ Includes \$852,000,000 of loans by Commodity Credit Corporation on commodities under loan. Amount of loans by Commodity Credit Corporation in other years not available.² Net increase in farm property equity, 1941-43.

Source: Bureau of Agricultural Economics, U. S. Department of Agriculture.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I started about a week ago to dictate what I have said today. In the last 2 days, yesterday and the day before, the New York Times, in two very lucid editorials, has expressed precisely the same views regarding the subject that I have just expressed. The Washington Post of yesterday morning expressed much the same view. I ask unanimous consent that the editorials from the New York Times of November 15 and 16 and the editorial from the Washington Post of November 16 be included in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times of December 15, 1943]

SUBSIDIES AND INFLATION

The subsidy debate has reached the point where extremists on both sides are engaging in a fear campaign. The opponents of subsidies hold that such payments will be highly inflationary; the proponents argue that the elimination of subsidies will mean a doubling of prices within a year. Regardless of which side is successful, therefore, a large group of people will believe that a drastic price inflation is imminent. It is necessary, therefore, to examine the inflation arguments dispassionately and to obtain a sense of perspective as to what is involved if either of the alternatives is adopted. Such an examination reveals that some of the claims of both groups have been grossly exaggerated. Let us examine each in turn.

It is argued that if we pay \$1,500,000,000 for subsidies that this will be highly infla-

tionary. If the amount could be held down to this, however, there would be little justification for this charge. Subsidy payments must be viewed as part of the broad problem of war finance. During the current fiscal year the Federal deficit will be about \$57,000,000,000. If the above amount were added for subsidies, the total deficit would become \$58,500,000,000. It is not realistic to assume that fifty-seven is not inflationary and that fifty-eight and one-half is inflationary, or to assume that the extra \$1,500,000,000 would be the straw to break the camel's back.

If this is true, wherein lies the danger that subsidies may be inflationary? The danger lies in the abuse of subsidies rather than in their use. Unless they were paid under carefully specified conditions it could easily develop that the path of least resistance would be to accede to demands for high wages and high prices, and then to try to offset these increases by subsequent subsidy payments. That this is not a theoretical danger is clearly indicated by the following passage from the President's recent food message:

"On the farm as in industry the war has pushed costs above the levels that prevailed before the outbreak of war. * * * These are costs of war, and it is entirely appropriate that they should be met out of the Public Treasury, just as are the costs of producing tanks and planes and ships and guns."

Many of the increases in costs, however, were not directly attributable to the war. They could have been avoided. Subsidies must clearly be limited, therefore, to unavoidable increases in costs due to the war.

Subsidies are most dangerous when they are not accompanied, as the President has admitted, by "wise" fiscal policies and "firm" wage and price policies. In Great Britain and Canada, where subsidies have been used with

substantial effect, it has been these fiscal, price, and wage policies which have made the major contribution to stability. Subsidies were only used to supplement them.

Let us turn now to the other argument. Would the elimination of subsidies result in a doubling of prices in 3 months and a trebling in 6 months, as recently stated by William Green, head of the A. F. of L.? The answer is an emphatic "No." According to the O. P. A., food costs would rise by 7 percent if all food subsidies were eliminated. This would be equivalent to about 2.8 percent in the cost-of-living index. But even this figure overstates the rise somewhat. Thus, the O. P. A. food price chief has testified that the withdrawal of all food subsidies would mean an addition of a \$1,890,000,000 to the food bill of civilians. This figure may be compared with total estimated consumers' expenditures of \$90,000,000,000 in 1943, or an increase of only 2 percent.

If the roll-back subsidies on meat, butter, and peanut butter were eliminated, and other food-subsidy programs continued, the cost-of-living index would increase only slightly more than 1 percent. It is argued, however, that labor would insist upon further wage increases should this increase in living costs be permitted on top of that which has previously taken place. But a resolute policy by the administration could insure that except in the case of substandard wages no further wage increases would be permitted. Certainly, the data on wage rates and weekly earnings do not indicate that organized labor in manufacture, which has been most vociferous in this subsidy battle, has suffered a deterioration of living standards during this war.

What, then, is the explanation for the recent fantastic forecasts of price rises? It seems clear that the proponents of the sub-

sidy program have been confusing subsidy payments and price ceilings. They have assumed that the elimination or modification of subsidies means the end of price ceilings. This is simply not so. Moreover, it cannot be emphasized too strongly that maximum price regulations have been the major factor keeping prices down. If there were no subsidies we would still continue price ceilings. While some advances in prices might be necessary, they would undoubtedly be moderate as compared with those that might take place in the absence of price control.

In sum, certain subsidies can be useful in the battle against inflationary price increases and as a device to stimulate essential production. But a well-considered subsidy program has only a subordinate role to play at best. It should be possible to work out an effective compromise which will permit the use of helpful subsidies and prohibit the use of dangerous ones.

[From the New York Times of December 16, 1943]

A SUBSIDY COMPROMISE

The battle against inflation will not necessarily succeed or fail because of the action now taken concerning subsidies. But a reasonable compromise retaining those subsidies which can aid in the battle and discarding those which have the opposite tendency will indicate that a sense of balance is being achieved. A workable compromise at the present juncture might include these points:

1. A prohibition of roll-back subsidies. It is these payments that have precipitated the bitter opposition to subsidies. Because of failure to distinguish clearly between different types of subsidies, these payments are threatening to destroy what is useful in the subsidy program. To prohibit them would merely restore the prices of meat, butter, and peanut butter to the levels prevailing prior to the introduction of roll-back subsidies. Their elimination would result in an increase in the cost of living index of only slightly more than 1 percent. This would be a small price to pay for stopping a very dangerous type of payment.

2. O. P. A. should be provided with a designated sum for a year's subsidies, perhaps with the proviso that no more than one-third or so of this amount may be spent in any 3-month period. Such a proviso could help to remove congressional fears that the O. P. A. might once more evade a congressional mandate.

3. Periodic reports might be required, possibly every 3 months, on subsidy payments. Such reports should include a detailed description of the mechanics and operation of each program, estimates of the savings effected, evidence of continuing need, and administrative costs. Such information, if filed promptly, would make it possible for Congress to check any abuses that might develop.

4. The conditions under which subsidies may be used should be clearly stated in the legislation. Experience in this country, as well as in other countries, has indicated that certain safeguards are necessary. In the recent hearings on the subsidy bill the O. P. A. submitted a memorandum showing the standards which should be used in paying subsidies (House hearings on H. R. 3477, pp. 335-333). The more important included: "(a) Subsidies should be granted only for commodities important to war production or the cost of living; (b) subsidy must be required to obtain necessary production and distribution at prices consistent with stabilization program; (c) all feasible steps to reduce costs shall have been taken before a subsidy program is put into operation; (d) price adjustments at earlier or later stages of production or distribution must be explored before subsidies are used; (e) subsidies should not be used unless there is a direct net saving from their use." Safeguards similar to these

could conveniently be included in the legislation itself. Since they have been proposed by O. P. A., subsidy supporters could not object to their adoption.

A limited use of subsidies under these conditions could prove helpful in stabilizing prices. But the useful role of subsidies at best can be only a subordinate one. The main elements in any program to limit inflation still remain price and wage stabilization and a fiscal policy designed to siphon off additional amounts of excess purchasing power. Unless these primary measures are taken, subsidies, so far from helping to control inflation, could only increase the danger.

[From the Washington Post of December 16, 1943]

COMPROMISE!

Congress has a duty to the American people to settle the subsidy issue before adjournment. The likelihood seems to be that the Senate will put off the vote and extend the life of the Commodity Credit Corporation for the interim. But any such postponement till after the New Year would seriously hamper farmers and price-control agencies that should be laying plans for next year. In these circumstances we would most strongly urge a compromise.

The bill passed by the House and now before the Senate prohibits only roll-back consumer subsidies and subsidies imposed to avoid increasing price ceilings. These are now in force. Food subsidies provided by means of support prices and loans for the purpose of stimulating production are not prohibited by the pending bill. In our opinion, the so-called roll-back subsidies employed to reduce prices charged consumers at retail are economically undesirable. We wish they had never been utilized. We also believe that the economic effects of suddenly sweeping away all such subsidies have been grossly exaggerated. According to O. P. A. estimates, the sweeping away of the roll-back subsidies now in force would raise the food index slightly over 7 percent and add about 3 percent to the general cost-of-living index. Certainly an increase of 3 percent in living costs would not be a valid excuse for the exorbitant wage demands that, according to William H. Davis, Chairman of the W. L. B., and other administration spokesmen, would follow the dropping of subsidy roll-backs.

A great deal of mischief has been done by official promises to labor that living costs would be rolled back and by ill-advised official warnings that disaster impends if the roll-back subsidies are dropped. Indeed, labor leaders have virtually been advised that if the administration loses out in the current subsidy fight, the last obstacle to uncontrolled wage increases and uncontrollable inflation will be removed. In view, therefore, of the explosive conditions fostered by official prophets of doom, it would be politically foolhardy to throw the roll-back subsidies overboard at this juncture. Certainly a subsidy outlay of between one and two billion dollars would be a bagatelle compared with the cost to the Government and to the people of this country of a collapse of the price- and wage-control program.

Congress could—and should—set a maximum limit to the amount that can be used for roll-back subsidies—possibly a sum roughly equivalent to the amount needed to finance the existing program. It might also forbid extension of the roll-back program without specific congressional authorization and place a time limit on use of subsidies, as suggested by the minority members of the House Committee on Banking and Currency. Since the subsidy bill, in extending the life of the Commodity Credit Corporation, makes that agency accountable to Congress rather than the President for its acts and policies, legislative control over the food-subsidy program would be assured in any event. That

makes the case for a reasonable compromise all the stronger.

Mr. HAWKES. Mr. President, I wish to compliment the Senator from Kansas for presenting to the Senate a most illuminating set of facts and figures, the preparation of which must have required a tremendous amount of work on his part. I think his presentation has been splendid.

Mr. REED. I thank the Senator from New Jersey.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution is open to amendment. If there is no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading and was read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now is, Shall the joint resolution pass?

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 103) was passed.

Mr. BARKHEAD subsequently said:

Mr. President, in view of the fact that consideration of the Commodity Credit Corporation bill has been put over until after the 1st of January, I thought it appropriate to issue a short statement dealing with the subject. I had rather hoped to address the Senate on the subject today, but I doubt the wisdom of undertaking to do so at this time. However, I have issued a short statement which I wish to read and have carried in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

I regret very deeply the delay in considering the Commodity Credit Corporation bill, which has been occasioned by those who oppose the passage of the House or Senate bill restricting the payment of consumer food subsidies.

I have done all I could to get action on this measure at the earliest possible date, and the War Food Administration and the bulk of the farm organizations have also urged that there be no delay.

We suffered a temporary setback when the Senate Banking and Currency Committee, by a margin of one vote, rejected my bill to continue the Commodity Credit Corporation so as to provide support prices necessary to get abundant farm production and to eliminate the payment of food subsidies.

We will not relax our efforts in the least to prevent a broad program of food subsidies being forced on the American people at a time when consumer incomes are the highest in history.

I am confident that the sentiment against consumer subsidies will be stronger than ever when consumers get the true facts and when Senators and Congressmen return here after talking to their constituents.

The public has been misled by an organized scare campaign designed to make consumers believe that the only alternative to food subsidies is run-away prices and wild inflation. Many absurd and fantastic statements to that effect have been made by leaders of the prosubsidy forces.

The proposed system of consumer subsidies is highly inflationary, and the ultimate costs to the public will be more than will be the case if such subsidies are avoided.

I am confident that once the consuming public learns the truth about the situation it will overwhelmingly reject the present subsidy program. I firmly believe that the average consumer prefers to pay his own grocery bill in its entirety, rather than to pass part of it on to present and future taxpayers, a larger percentage of whom will be

* the members of our armed forces who are fighting on our world-wide battle fronts today.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3598) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes; that the House had receded from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 11, 35, 40, 48, 55, 63, 67, 70, and 95 to the bill, and concurred therein; that the House receded from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 8, 12, and 38, and concurred therein, severally with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate; that the House insisted upon its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 13, 20, 22, 23, 26, 37, 39, 49, 54, and 96 of the bill, asked a further conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. CANNON of Missouri, Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia, Mr. LUDLOW, Mr. SNYDER, Mr. O'NEAL, Mr. RABAUT, Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma, Mr. TABER, Mr. WIGLESWORTH, Mr. LAMBERTSON, and Mr. POWERS were appointed managers on the part of the House at the further conference.

AMENDMENT OF NATIONALITY ACT OF 1940

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado in the chair) laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2207) to amend the Nationality Act of 1940, and requesting a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. MALONEY. I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments, agree to the request of the House for a conference, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. MALONEY, Mr. ANDREWS, and Mr. BALL conferees on the part of the Senate.

IMPORTATION OF LIVESTOCK FEED— SOCIAL SECURITY PAY-ROLL TAX

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, pursuant to the program announced earlier in the day by the majority leader, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House Joint Resolution 171.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution will be stated by title.

The CHIEF CLERK. A joint resolution (H. J. Res. 171) to permit the importation from foreign countries free of duty, during a period of 90 days, of certain grains and other products to be used for livestock and poultry feed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution, which had been reported from the Committee on Finance with an amendment.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I understand it is the purpose of the Senator from Michigan to propose an amendment to House Joint Resolution 171, affecting the Social Security Act. Is that true?

Mr. VANDENBERG. If the Senator will permit me I shall make a very brief statement to indicate what is contemplated, and the necessity for it.

Mr. President, the Senate Finance Committee has voted by a very large majority in favor of maintaining the 1-percent pay-roll tax under social security, a tax which under the existing statute otherwise would automatically increase to 2 percent on New Year's Day. That action of the Senate Finance Committee is in connection with the pending tax bill. Unfortunately the tax bill cannot reach the Senate for final action before the new year. Therefore, beginning on New Year's Day, except as we deal with the situation today, there will be a state of confusion and chaos in respect to the pay-roll taxes, because, while there will be pending a provision for the freezing of the pay-roll tax, yet the action achieving that result will not occur until later in January.

Therefore the Senate Finance Committee yesterday unanimously recommended that House Joint Resolution 171, the only available House bill before the Senate, be used as a vehicle to give this problem precisely the same kind of treatment which has been given to the Commodity Credit Corporation problem. In other words, as reported, the joint resolution carries an amendment which has the unanimous approval of the Senate Finance Committee and simply freezes the situation for 60 days until Congress has a chance to deal finally and definitely with the question of what the pay-roll tax shall be in 1944. Unless this is done, Mr. President, every employer in this country and every employee on social security, 40,000,000 of them, will be in a state of confusion during the first 2 or 3 weeks in January. Employers will have temporarily to change their withholding bases, employees will temporarily have to increase their contributions, yet the whole thing may retroactively be changed when the tax bill is passed.

The sole purpose of the amendment, I will say to my able friend the junior Senator from Montana, is not at all to settle the question of what shall be the pay-roll tax when it is standardized for next year. I may say to the Senator that in the committee those members who oppose the "freezing" of the pay-roll tax next year agreed that this device is necessary in order to prevent during the first few weeks in January a state of utter confusion which would involve every employer in the country and every employee on social security.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I should like to inquire from the able senior Senator from Michigan if it is not a fact that the representatives of the labor unions appeared at the hearings and objected to the action proposed by the Senator.

Mr. VANDENBERG. The Senator is not discussing the pending question; the Senator is asking me whether the labor unions do not oppose the "freeze" for 1944.

Mr. MURRAY. Yes.

Mr. VANDENBERG. The Senator is entirely correct; but I suggest to him that that question is not involved today. We are not at all prejudging the issue for 1944. We are simply endeavoring to create a situation whereby Congress can deal with the issue after January without an interim of utter chaos and confusion when employers and employees will not know what the withholding tax is ultimately to be.

Mr. MURRAY. It would seem to me that this matter is one of such vital importance and serious consequence that it should not be disposed of in this manner, as a rider to a measure which is utterly unrelated to the subject.

Mr. VANDENBERG. If the Senator will permit me, let me say that I am afraid I have not made it plain that we are not proposing to dispose of anything. We are simply endeavoring to create a 60-day period during which the Senate and the House will have time to act.

Mr. MURRAY. Of course. However, that would lay the basis for the taking of action within that period for the purpose of preventing the rise in the pay-roll tax, a rise which is necessary in order to carry out the purposes of the Social Security Act.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I would not so construe the proposed action of the Senate, I will say to the Senator; and I certainly would not undertake to use the action today as any precedent or as any prejudice in connection with the fundamental question. I agree with the Senator that the fundamental question should have full and complete consideration by the Senate and by the House. The only thing in the world we are proposing to do is to create such a situation that the Senate and the House can give the subject the full consideration which I agree with the Senator it requires.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. I wish to state for the benefit of my friend the junior Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] that I was one of those on the Committee on Finance who voted against the freezing of the social-security tax at its present rate. I was in the minority on the committee; and the committee adopted as a part of the tax bill the amendment freezing the tax—that is to say, prohibiting the automatic increase on January 1. That amendment is incorporated in the tax bill as reported from the committee and will be threshed out on the floor of the Senate when the tax bill is taken up. Even though the 60-day pe-

riod of suspension is granted, if the Senate rejects the amendment, then the increase will automatically go into effect; because provision for the freezing is not contained in the House bill, as I recall, and that matter would have to go to conference. Even if the Senate adopted the amendment freezing the tax at its present rate, it would still have to go to conference, to be threshed out there. If in the consideration of the tax bill the Senate rejected the amendment, then the increased tax would automatically go into effect.

The amendment is offered to this bill, because the tax bill cannot be passed before the 1st of January. What the amendment now before the Senate would do would be simply to hold the matter in abeyance until the Senate can thresh out the matter on the floor, in connection with consideration of the tax bill.

In my judgment, no rights will be lost by anyone interested in the matter, because, after all, it must be threshed out and determined by the Senate as a part of the tax bill.

I desired to make that explanation as one of those who in committee voted against the proposed amendment to freeze the tax as it is now, commencing January 1.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I should like to add to what was said by the Senator from Kentucky in his remarks to the Senator from Montana that, while I do not agree with the labor unions on this subject, and while I completely agree with those who would "freeze" the tax as it is for the next calendar year, yet I entirely agree with the wisdom of the 60-day device for preventing total disruption of the pay-roll system during the first 1, 2, or 3 weeks in January, until the Congress has a chance to consider the matter further.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, if the Senator will permit, I should like to say further that if what is proposed by the amendment is not done, and if on the 1st of January the increased tax automatically goes into effect, then it must be withheld and collected by the employers. If subsequently the Congress should adopt the proposal freezing the tax, then the employers would be required to repay the amounts collected, or make adjustments for them, and would immediately be required to repay the money to those from whom they might have collected it.

Mr. VANDENBERG. From approximately 40,000,000 persons.

Mr. BARKLEY. Yes; from approximately 40,000,000 persons, which undoubtedly would create a very confusing situation.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I yield.

Mr. MURRAY. I was merely going to say that I was unfamiliar with the purpose of the Senator from Michigan in proposing the amendment to House Joint Resolution 171, but it occurred to me that, if it would have the effect of "freezing" the rise of the tax, it would be a matter for which full opportunity for discussion on the floor of the Senate should be provided.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I totally agree with the Senator that the issue is of that magnitude, and I can assure him that the proposed device is only one to bridge a gap during the first 1, 2, or 3 weeks in January, pending the time when we shall have a chance to give the subject the precise consideration which the Senator requests in behalf of it.

Mr. MURRAY. I thank the Senator for the explanation. My understanding was that the proposed freezing of the tax at its present rate would be opposed not only by the labor unions but also by many other persons who are interested in the successful administration of the Social Security Act.

Mr. VANDENBERG. That may well be, on the main issue. I am not arguing that with the Senator today.

Mr. MURRAY. I have before me an extract from an editorial, published in the Wall Street Journal, which discusses this matter and points out the objections to the course proposed by the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Now the Senator is discussing the main question; he is not discussing the matter pending here today.

Mr. MURRAY. That is correct.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Yes.

Mr. MURRAY. But I merely desire to call attention to the fact that there is widespread and vigorous opposition to the purpose.

Mr. VANDENBERG. There is no doubt about that.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I yield.

Mr. McCARRAN. I have not had occasion to read the amendment upon which the Senator from Michigan has requested action by the Senate; but, as I understand, it proposes that for the first 60 days of 1944 the tax shall be frozen at its present rate. Is that correct?

Mr. VANDENBERG. That is correct. It is simply to prevent the automatic operation of the existing statute during those 60 days, while the Senate and the House will have an opportunity to decide the basic question. No other purpose is involved.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield, so that I may say a few words?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I yield to the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. GEORGE. I should like to say that it is obvious, I think, that the House will not have a quorum present next week. After consultation with the majority leader, who talked with several members of the Finance Committee, it was deemed proper and advisable to have the committee act on the bill and report it to the Senate, with no expectation that it could be taken up and disposed of at this season of the year, prior to January 1. If the Congress should take a recess until January 3 or 5 or 10, the bill would then be ready to be taken up immediately after the expiration of the recess; and, after the passage of the bill by the Senate, it would immediately go to conference. If in the tax bill there should be no provision for freezing the

social security tax at its present rate, the new rates or the stepped-up rates would immediately become operative. I should think the conferees would be through with the tax bill by the 15th or 20th of January, at least.

Mr. GREEN rose.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I yield to the Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, unfortunately I was not in the Chamber when the amendment was being discussed. May I have the clerk read it?

Mr. VANDENBERG. The language is rather technical. I think perhaps I can explain it to the Senator.

Mr. GREEN. I should like to have the amendment stated, as well as to hear the explanation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McCLELLAN in the chair). The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 2, after line 11, it is proposed to insert the following:

SEC. 3. (a) Clauses (1) and (2) of section 1400 of the Federal Insurance Contributions Act (Internal Revenue Code, sec. 1400) are amended to read as follows:

"(1) With respect to wages received during the calendar years 1939, 1940, 1941, 1942, 1943, and the first 2 calendar months of the calendar year 1944, the rate shall be 1 percent.

"(2) With respect to wages received during the last 10 calendar months of the calendar year 1944 and during the calendar year 1945, the rate shall be 2 percent."

(b) Clauses (1) and (2) of section 1410 of such act (Internal Revenue Code, sec. 1410) are amended to read as follows:

"(1) With respect to wages paid during the calendar years 1939, 1940, 1941, 1942, 1943, and the first 2 calendar months of the calendar year 1944, the rate shall be 1 percent.

"(2) With respect to wages paid during the last 10 calendar months of the calendar year 1944 and during the calendar year 1945, the rate shall be 2 percent."

Mr. VANDENBERG. When all that language is boiled down the net result is simply to move forward from January 1 to February 28, the date when the statutory increase in pay-roll taxes becomes effective. If the Senate and House act on the question prior thereto the effective date will be whatever date the House and Senate decide upon. The sole purpose is to avoid the hiatus in January, when employers would be at a loss to know whether they should take 1 percent or 2 percent from the pay rolls.

Mr. GREEN. What would be the result if the Congress should not act during the 60 days?

Mr. VANDENBERG. If the Congress should not act during the 60-day period, the automatic increase would go into effect on March 1.

Mr. GREEN. The 2 percent?

Mr. VANDENBERG. That is correct. The sole purpose of the amendment, to which the Senate Finance Committee has given its unanimous approval, is to bridge the gap due to the fact that we are unable to report the tax bill before the first of the year.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. TABER: Page 12, after line 17, insert a new paragraph, as follows:

"Provided further, That notwithstanding any provisions to the contrary in the act approved July 12, 1943 (Public Law 132), funds available to the War Manpower Commission for the current migration of Mexican or Canadian nationals under the auspices of the War Manpower Commission for industrial and railroad purposes essential to the war effort, may continue to be expended during the fiscal year 1944."

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, so that the House may understand this amendment, there is \$140,000 that has been allocated out of the President's funds to the War Manpower Commission to permit them to promote the migration of Canadian and Mexican workers into the United States temporarily in a similar manner to the manner in which they are being brought in here for work upon the railroads in this country. It has been used quite successfully and we would like to have it continued, especially in view of the fact that the paragraph relating to the importation of Puerto Rican laborers was cut out of the deficiency bill that was up here yesterday.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from New York and I have conferred on this amendment, and it is entirely acceptable to the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the subsection numbers on page 12 (i) and (j) be changed to (j) and (k), respectively.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON]?

There was no objection.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. THOMASON, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 208) making an appropriation to assist in providing a supply and distribution of farm labor for the calendar year 1944, had directed him to report the same back to the House with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to, and that the bill as amended do pass.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill and all amendments thereto to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them in gross.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD on the bill and also to extend my own remarks that I made today.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON]?

There was no objection.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a joint resolution of the House of the following title:

H. J. Res. 171. Joint resolution to permit the importation from foreign countries free of duty, during a period of 90 days, of certain grains and other products to be used for livestock and poultry feed.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the foregoing joint resolution, requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. GEORGE, Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts, and Mr. VANDENBERG to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3598) entitled "An act making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate disagrees to the amendments of the House to the amendments of the Senate numbered 8, 12, and 38 to the foregoing bill; further insists upon its amendments numbered 8, 12, 13, 20, 22, 23, 26, 37, 38, 39, 49, 94, and 96 to said bill disagreed to by the House, agrees to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. McKELLAR, Mr. GLASS, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. TYDINGS, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. NYE, Mr. LODGE, and Mr. HOLMAN to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed a joint resolution of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. J. Res. 103. Joint resolution continuing the Commodity Credit Corporation as an agency of the United States.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the bill (H. R. 2207) entitled "An act

to amend the Nationality Act of 1940," disagreed to by the House; agrees to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. MALONEY, Mr. ANDREWS, and Mr. BALL to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

CONTINUING THE COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION AS AN AGENCY OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. SPENCE. -Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of Senate Joint Resolution 103 under the general rules of the House, and that there may be 30 minutes' general debate, to be divided equally between the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT] and myself.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SPENCE]?

There was no objection.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of Senate Joint Resolution 103, extending the life of the Commodity Credit Corporation.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of Senate Joint Resolution 103, with Mr. COOPER in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The first reading of the joint resolution was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SPENCE] is recognized for 15 minutes, and the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. PACE. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. PACE. Mr. Chairman, due to the fact that printed copies are not available, would it be in order to ask unanimous consent to read the entire resolution for the information of the House?

The CHAIRMAN. It would. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PACE]?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 103), as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the first sentence of section 7 of the act approved January 31, 1935 (49 Stat. 4), as amended, is hereby amended by striking out "December 31, 1943" and inserting in lieu thereof "February 29, 1944."

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, this resolution merely continues the life of the Commodity Credit Corporation from January 1 until February 29, 1944. It makes no change in the existing law. If this resolution is not passed by the end of this year, the Commodity Credit Corporation dies by expiration of the time for which it was created.

The Commodity Credit Corporation has been a useful agency. I think every Member of this House who represents an agricultural district knows of the services it has rendered to the people. It has not resorted to artificial devices, but has gone into the market and operated under the fundamental and economic law of supply and demand. It has given to the farmer a price and a market place for his product that he otherwise would not have had and certainly no one here wants to see that useful organization die.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPENCE. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I understand that the gentleman is agreeable to accepting an amendment which the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KLEBERG] is to offer which would limit the extension to February 5. Is that true?

Mr. SPENCE. I have not really considered that. May I say that the Senate has had charge of this bill. The Senate says it will take 60 days to perfect the legislation. It seems to me the Senate is the judge as to what time it will take to consider legislation that has been heretofore passed by the House. I do know what effect the continuation of 30 days would have. It will mean a shortening of the vacation.

The time the life of the Commodity Credit Corporation is continued is up to the House. The Senate has said it needs 60 days. My great interest is in seeing that the Commodity Credit Corporation is kept alive.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I agree with the gentleman. The reason I am interrupting him is I thought, if he would agree to the amendment, perhaps we would not need to have so much discussion as if there were a conquest.

Mr. SPENCE. I have not had a chance to discuss this matter with the committee and I do not feel I have the right to agree to it; however, I am not opposing the amendment to be offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KLEBERG].

It is up to the House. I am not going to resist it. If the House feels it should be 30 days, it is satisfactory to me. I think it is a question for them to decide.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for another question?

Mr. SPENCE. I yield.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Do I understand now that the time has been limited to 15 minutes on each side?

Mr. SPENCE. That is the agreement.

Mr. LUDLOW. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPENCE. I yield.

Mr. LUDLOW. During this period of extension the function of the Corporation will continue as it is going on now?

Mr. SPENCE. There is no change in the existing law at all. It merely continues the Commodity Credit Corporation until February 29, 1944. I may say this resolution, I understand, was passed by the Senate without debate. That certainly would indicate there is nothing controversial in it.

Mr. RAYBURN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPENCE. I yield.

Mr. RAYBURN. We might shorten this matter if the gentleman from Kentucky would yield to the gentleman from Texas to offer his amendment unless somebody else wants to take time in the general debate.

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Chairman—

Mr. SPENCE. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kentucky has not yet expired.

Mr. GIFFORD. We are entitled to half of the time. I do not want to speak, but I want to make a brief comment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has 15 minutes. The gentleman from Kentucky has 15 minutes and he yielded himself 5 minutes which has not yet expired.

Mr. GIFFORD. That is perfectly all right with me.

Mr. KLEBERG. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPENCE. I yield.

Mr. KLEBERG. The amendment which I have to offer is an amendment changing the date from February 29 to February 5, 1944. In view of the very fair statement the gentleman from Kentucky has made, I have no desire to prolong the debate. The matter has been amply discussed here and over on the other side and so far as I am concerned I will have nothing to say on the amendment whatsoever. The amendment speaks for itself. The time should be ample for the Senate to draft any bill other than a tax bill, as fully informed as they are on it.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPENCE. I yield.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I wish to ask the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KLEBERG] this question: The gentleman does, however, propose to submit his amendment changing the date from February 29 to February 5, 1944?

Mr. KLEBERG. I do, as soon as we read the resolution.

Mr. CRAWFORD. So that the Committee will have a chance to have debate on it.

Mr. KLEBERG. As soon as the general debate is over.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPENCE. I yield.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. It is very necessary that something be done as soon as possible to extend the life of the Commodity Credit Corporation in view of the fact that Mr. Marvin Jones wants to make an announcement of the program to farmers who are producing the war crops and he is very anxious to announce that program as early as possible.

Mr. PATMAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPENCE. I yield.

Mr. PATMAN. If the extension of the Commodity Credit Corporation is agreed upon for 60 days, that will not prevent the same argument being made as was made by our distinguished colleague the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BROWN], that the legislation should be expedited. But I think it is very necessary we extend the Commodity Credit Corporation for a sufficient length of time so as not to jeopardize

the life of that Corporation. It must be remembered that there are millions of bales of cotton, which is just one commodity involved in this, and if the support price is taken out from under the Commodity Credit Corporation cotton that is now selling at 20 cents a pound, it probably would not be selling at 10 cents a pound very soon, because there is an enormous surplus of cotton. Foreign countries cannot buy that cotton because there is a lack of ocean transportation and there are many things about it unlike the other war that would cause the price of cotton immediately to slump and probably go down one-half.

Mr. SPENCE. I reserve the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kentucky has consumed 6 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. GIFFORD. I want to make a brief observation.

We are all agreed on the extension of the life of the Commodity Credit Corporation. I do not expect anyone to vote against it. The question at issue is how long a time we are to allow administration leaders to browbeat us into obedience. Think of the great majority in both branches of this Congress desiring this legislation. But, it is to be a question as to how much time shall be granted to allow those in the extreme minority to urge others to change their votes so that we may lack the two-thirds to finally save the measure? Some of us feel that February 5 is long enough to subject Members to that sort of treatment. You can see what has happened in the last few days in the other body. Great pressure has been brought to bear to postpone to gain time. It is most annoying. If you harp on a thing long enough you will get believers.

In my own district you now have a few converts, because certain commentators favorable to the administration are making some of my people believe in the consumer subsidies. They are trying to frighten our people by misrepresenting the effect of this antisubsidy program. These few are loyally expressing the views of a stubborn administration. We certainly have the arguments against consumer subsidies. We have had the courage to put the bill over. The minority feel that all they need now is time. They desire to annoy us as long as possible, hoping to force enough of us to change our votes. That is the only issue today. We understand it. We desire to be reasonable. We have gone a long way when we agree to extend the time to February 5. We do not think we should allow 60 days for the administrative whiplash to be wielded. I long for the day when sometime again we will have leaders here who will lead us where we decide to go, instead of managers for the administration to drive us. I have said this before. I resent it.

Although the great majority are for this legislation, it will be postponed and the whip used until we lack the two-thirds vote probably necessary. It tempts me to believe that the two-thirds vote should be repealed; that no man should have two votes to my one. In

such a matter as this the majority should prevail. But I do not want to scrap the Constitution of the United States. I love it and I like to hold to the old tried methods as long as we can. Wisely used they would still be the best. Again I want to make it emphatic that we are fair on this side, when we compromise on February 5. It is simply a grasp for time and I stigmatize it as such that we may fully understand the situation. Do not drag any red herring across the issue, none of us are opposed to the extension of the life of the Commodity Credit Corporation. Do not take the time now to argue the merits of subsidies. Do not waste further time today in arguing that policy. We have watched some of you "rub the itch of your poor opinion on subsidies until you should have scabs already." We have been highly educated to your point of view and wholly unconvinced. The great majority of both branches of the Congress have spoken and spoken emphatically on this matter. This is simply a dilatory method to gain time for the administration. How long shall we endure these methods: "Quousque tandem abutere, O Imperator, patientia nostra."

Let us speak our own minds by at least February 5. Longer postponement is not justified and the reason it is desired is too transparent. But we will compromise on February 5. I trust I have not injured anybody's feelings by talking plainly, but I think it necessary that the real question here shall not become beclouded.

I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD].

Mr. CRAWFORD. I want to say in response to the observation made by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN], if I understood him correctly, if I understand the position of the War Food Administrator, Mr. Marvin Jones, the announcement of the 1944 food-producing program has been withheld pending action on this subsidy question. And starting in the grand State of California where planting has already begun and moving eastward, it seems to me if we extend this time beyond February 5, we are doing a great injustice to our people whom we expect to get this food production from in 1944. I am not going to take any additional time of the House except to say that so far as I am concerned I am opposed to the February 29 date, and I shall be glad to support the February 5 date.

The CHAIRMAN. If there is no further debate the Clerk will read.

The Clerk again read the resolution.

Mr. KLEBERG. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. KLEBERG: On page 1, line 6, strike out "February 29, 1944" and insert "February 5, 1944."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his amendment.

Mr. KLEBERG. I yield my time back. The amendment speaks for itself, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas.

The question was taken; and upon a division (demanded by Mr. SPENCE) there were—ayes 103, noes 27.

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the resolution back to the House with an amendment, with the recommendation that the amendment be agreed to and the resolution, as amended, do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker, having resumed the chair, Mr. COOPER, chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 103), directed him to report the same back to the House with an amendment adopted in Committee of the Whole House, with the recommendation that the amendment agreed to and the resolution as amended do pass.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution and amendment to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the third reading of the Senate joint resolution.

The Senate joint resolution was ordered to be read a third time and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the resolution.

The resolution was passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ELIMINATING PRIVATE SUITS FOR PENALTIES AND DAMAGES ARISING OUT OF FRAUDS AGAINST THE UNITED STATES

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 1203) to eliminate private suits for penalties and damages arising out of frauds against the United States, and I ask unanimous consent that the statement may be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER]?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

(For conference report and statement, see proceedings of the House, December 6, 1943.)

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, at the time the House, by unanimous consent, repealed entirely the so-called informer's bill, the attention of the committee was not called to the fact that conceivably the chief law enforcement officer of the United States would not proceed against an individual in an appropriate action. When the bill reached the Senate, the Senate provided for that situation, and wrote, not satisfactorily, a bill that would make it possible for the United States to proceed, and at the same time permit individuals,

as was the case under the old Informer's Act, to proceed.

The original law was passed back in 1863, at a time when we did not have the F. B. I. and all of the many Government investigating agencies. It was passed for the purpose of making it possible for the United States, in an appropriate action to recover against people who had perpetrated frauds against the United States. Since the enactment of the original legislation, but few actions have been brought until during this war period. Now, the country is literally covered with racketeering suits. As a matter of fact, the latest count that I had showed 250 cases, in none of which has any service been rendered to the United States.

There has been a contention that there were four actions in which informers brought suits in good faith, and that information was not available to the Department of Justice. As to those, there is some dispute. But if there are any actions brought in good faith by informers, then, under this compromise measure, those informers will have the right to proceed with their actions and recover.

The only effect this legislation would have under the laws under which the action was brought would be that the amount that could be recovered is reduced from 15 percent to 25 percent. In view of the fact that these actions are for huge sums of money, I do not know that that makes much difference.

I will call attention to a few of the 250 or more cases that have been brought and the amounts involved. One \$6,000,000; in two, \$2,000,000; in three, \$2,000,000; in four, \$40,000,000; in five, \$40,000,000; in six, \$100,000 plus \$400,000 in penalties; in seven, \$2,000,000, and so on.

So we do not think that cutting the amount of the award from 50 to 25 percent is going to work a very great hardship on any one event there is a bona fide action.

Now, as to the cases where the United States feels there is no ground for recovery, in those cases the United States may become a party by merely intervening. Then if the United States decides that there is no case and gets out of it the individual may proceed on his own. However, if the United States decides to proceed in any of these cases, then the person who assisted in the recovery may be allowed up to 10 percent of the amount recovered.

In every case that will be brought in the future it will be necessary for the suitor to notify the United States attorney in the district in which the action is to be brought, and the Attorney General, in writing of the material facts which in his judgment form the basis of the suit. If the Attorney General fails to proceed, then the citizen may proceed on his own. It is then his case. He may proceed and recover if he can, and can be compensated for his work.

We feel that by enacting this compromise legislation the United States will be amply protected and at the same time there will not be this ever-present invitation to racketeers to examine indictments, to examine reports of the Truman

committee, or if you please, for dishonest and unscrupulous investigators to turn over information to their friends or co-conspirators for the purpose of bringing suit against our citizens on information that either comes to them by reading an indictment or a bill of complaint or through testimony before some committee or which comes to them in their official capacity as a representative of the United States.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALTER. I yield.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. What will happen to the suits already filed?

Mr. WALTER. In the suits already filed the United States has a right to intervene. If the United States does not choose to intervene, then the citizen who started the suit may proceed to prosecute the case to a conclusion.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Then as a practical matter, the passing of this bill will interfere with those who have originally filed suits? In other words, it does exactly what some people are attempting to say H. R. 3269 and H. R. 3270 accomplishes, which I deny. But, in these cases the Congress is interfering with the final conclusion of those suits.

Mr. WALTER. I do not know that you call it interfering to break up a racket. It seems to me it is most desirable that the United States step in and protect citizens who are being harassed and annoyed by this scheme that is nothing more nor less than glorified blackmail.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. By the same token I contend that Congress should step in and protect the interests of the citizen on the bill in which the gentleman is so interested.

Mr. SAUTHOFF. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALTER. I yield.

Mr. SAUTHOFF. I might also add that in these cases the informer bringing the suit has not been put to any expense, because they are usually brought on a contingent fee basis. Is not that correct?

Mr. WALTER. I think that is correct. Those people who have been interested in informer suits who appeared before the subcommittee and the conferees, have objected to the 25-percent provision. When we pinned them down to the reason for their objection it was that they felt they ought to get more money for rendering a very doubtful service.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALTER. I yield.

Mr. SPRINGER. In many of these informer suits which have been brought is it not a fact, I will ask the gentleman, that some of the men who brought these actions merely went to the court and practically copied the indictment which was then pending and made that the basis of a complaint upon which they based their informer suits to collect a large sum of money?

Mr. WALTER. That is not only the fact, but our attention was called to one case in New Orleans where a lawyer flew from California to New Orleans, got hold of an indictment within hours after it had been returned by the grand jury, used

that as the basis for his bill of complaint, and made the mistakes, grammatical and otherwise, that appeared in the indictment that had just been returned.

Mr. SPRINGER. And this particular bill is intended to correct that sort of procedure and stop that sort of racketeering?

Mr. WALTER. Exactly. We have no desire to interfere with suits which are brought honestly and legitimately by informers which the United States were not party to.

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALTER. I yield.

Mr. LEWIS. I should like to call the gentleman's attention also to the case against the Curtiss-Wright Co. filed in the United States District Court of Cincinnati for the Southern District of Ohio where a lawyer flew in from a far-distant place. He had heard about some complaint against that company. He filed a suit for \$100,000,000 against the Curtiss-Wright Co. and did it without any information except that which he obtained from Government files, and he rendered no service.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania has consumed 10 minutes.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 3 additional minutes.

I should like to add to what the gentleman from Ohio said in that particular case that, as I understand it, the so-called informer secured every bit of information in his bill of complaint from the indictment and thereafter endeavored to subpoena the Department of Justice files in order to make out a case on the allegations that he had set forth in his bill of complaint.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for an observation?

Mr. WALTER. I yield.

Mr. MICHENER. The Judiciary Committee gave a lot of attention to this matter. As one member I am thoroughly convinced that the statute has served a good purpose. It was set up at a time when it was serviceable. But by the same token, the same study, the same information, I am well satisfied that the statute has encouraged and made possible a system of racketeering which should be prevented. I know nothing about the changes made by the conferees, but on the whole I think the statute, if it should not be repealed entirely for the good of the people and the honesty of our people, should at least be amended to prevent a lot of this racketeering.

Mr. WALTER. I may say to the gentleman from Michigan that we would not be here today but for the fact that the Supreme Court held it was not necessary to have information in order to bring an informer suit; and the case in which this very tortuous decision, if I may be so presumptuous as to criticize the Supreme Court of the United States, was handed down, was brought in an action where every bit of information in the bill of complaint was adduced at a public hearing and the informer knew absolutely nothing about the facts in the case until after the Government had adduced them.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALTER. I yield.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. There is one element, however, that has not been brought out: That in order for the informer to recover, he must prove that a fraud had been committed by the accused against the Government.

Mr. WALTER. That is correct.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. In wartime, when the Government is subjected to all kinds of frauds, I think it is extremely dangerous to weaken those provisions which make possible recovery against fraudulent contracts.

Mr. WALTER. Of course the gentleman from New York must realize that nothing in this bill affects the right of the United States to proceed in respect to fraud under existing law, which permits the United States to proceed not only under the section that is being amended but under other law, is not affected by this report. I agree entirely with what the gentleman says that during wartime there is, of course, fraud that we do not come in contact with ordinarily, but at the same time, and by the same token, there are more people engaged in business who could be subjected to the sort of racketeering that is going on now. For that reason I feel that this bill should be enacted.

Mr. HANCOCK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALTER. I yield.

Mr. HANCOCK. I just want to point out to the gentleman that since the decision he referred to was rendered informer suits have multiplied very rapidly and are continuing to multiply.

The Department of Justice feels that the work of this office is being impaired and interfered with. In this connection I might say that the Attorney General feels that this bill, if passed, will kill about 200 cases pending under the former statute. At the same time he is opposed to a certain bill in which the gentleman and I are interested, H. R. 3270. I agree that it would interfere with the prosecution of insurance companies. He favors killing suits he does not like, but he likes to preserve those on which he has a different view.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. MILLER].

Mr. MILLER of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I think the conferees are to be commended for the industry they have shown in attempting to remedy a very lamentable condition that has prevailed respecting so-called informer suits. In their zeal to remedy this condition they have overlooked, in my judgment, and perhaps unwittingly placed limitations upon the prosecution of true informer actions which defeat the very purpose and in practical effect nullify the informer suits. For more than 80 years this country has followed the Lincoln statute on informer actions. In this connection, in 1863, Lincoln uttered these words:

Worse than traitors in arms are the men who pretend loyalty to the flag, feast and fatten on the misfortunes of the Nation while patriotic blood is crimsoning the plains

CONTINUING THE COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION
AS AN AGENCY OF THE UNITED STATES

DECEMBER 18, 1943.—Ordered to be printed

Mr. SPENCE, from the committee of conference, submitted the
following

CONFERENCE REPORT

[To accompany S. J. Res. 103]

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 103) continuing the Commodity Credit Corporation as an agency of the United States, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the House amendment insert the following: *February 17, 1944*; and the House agree to the same.

BRENT SPENCE,
THOMAS F. FORD,
PAUL BROWN,
WRIGHT PATMAN,
CHARLES L. GIFFORD,
FRED L. CRAWFORD,

Managers on the part of the House.

ALBEN W. BARKLEY,
FRANCIS MALONEY,
GEORGE L. RADCLIFFE,
JNO. THOMAS,

Managers on the part of the Senate.

STATEMENT OF THE MANAGERS ON THE PART OF THE HOUSE

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 103) continuing the Commodity Credit Corporation as an agency of the United States, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

As passed by the Senate this joint resolution continued the life of the Commodity Credit Corporation until February 29, 1944. The amendment of the House changed this date to February 5, 1944. The conference agreement makes the date February 17, 1944.

BRENT SPENCE,
THOMAS F. FORD,
PAUL BROWN,
WRIGHT PATMAN,
CHARLES L. GIFFORD,
FRED L. CRAWFORD,

Managers on the part of the House.





ath
e W

of



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 78th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 89

WASHINGTON, SATURDAY, DECEMBER 18, 1943

No. 199

Senate

(Legislative day of Wednesday, December 15, 1943)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock noon, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father God, Thou who in times past across yearning centuries spoke to the fathers through the prophets hath in the Word made flesh spoken to us in that One whose name is the Prince of Peace and upon whose shoulders the government of men must ultimately rest. We thank Thee that not on one wondrous night alone did a star of hope light the heavens, but that straight down the crowding years the starlit pathway leads, reminding our earth-filled eyes that the highest truth is born in lowly places, clad in humble garb befitting the humility of God and of Godlike humanity.

the Christmas star rains its fire on an earth plowed with spite and hate may we see in it a shining symbol that if we would find truth that is life indeed we must follow our starry ideals, no matter over what burning sands or to what lonely deserts they take our faltering feet. Save us from a festivity that knows nothing of receptivity and from decoration that forgets dedication. May the holly of this joyous season enshrine the holly, and its crimson beads be but emblems of the myrrh of sacrifice—the gift of our contrite hearts. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On a request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Friday, December 17, 1943, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED

Mrs. CARAWAY, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that on December 15, 1943, that committee presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills:

S. 1544. An act authorizing the acquisition and conversion or construction of certain auxiliary vessels, landing craft, and district craft for the United States Navy, and for other purposes; and

S. 1576. An act to provide for the extension of certain oil and gas leases.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT— APPROVAL OF BILLS

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he also announced that the President had approved and signed the following acts:

On December 5, 1943:

S. 763. An act amending the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, and for other purposes.

On December 17, 1943:

S. 861. An act to increase the amount of Federal aid to State or Territorial homes for the support of disabled soldiers and sailors of the United States;

S. 990. An act for the relief of the Washington, Brandywine & Point Lockout Railroad Co.;

S. 1001. An act for the relief of the Meadow Brook Club;

S. 1038. An act for the relief of Verna Mae Russell and Winifred Russell Mooney;

S. 1049. An act to authorize the payment of additional compensation to special counsel in the case of United States against Standard Oil Co. of California;

S. 1282. An act for the relief of Eric W. Rodgers;

S. 1290. An act for the relief of William Carroil Knox;

S. 1315. An act providing for the transfer to the custody and control of the Secretary of the Navy of certain lands comprising a portion of Croatan National Forest in the State of North Carolina; and

S. 1544. An act authorizing the acquisition and conversion or construction of certain auxiliary vessels, landing craft, and district craft for the United States Navy, and for other purposes.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 103) continuing the Commodity Credit Corporation as an agency of the United States, with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the report of the Committee of Conference on the disagree-

ing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 1203) to eliminate private suits for penalties and damages arising out of frauds against the United States.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 171) to permit the importation from foreign countries free of duty, during a period of 90 days, of certain grains and other products to be used for livestock and poultry feed.

The message also announced that the House had passed a joint resolution (H. J. Res. 208) making an appropriation to assist in providing a supply and distribution of farm labor for the calendar year 1944, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

CONTINUATION OF COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 103) continuing the Commodity Credit Corporation as an agency of the United States.

Mr. BARKLEY. I move that the Senate disagree to the House amendment, request a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Vice President appointed Mr. BARKLEY, Mr. MALONEY, Mr. RADCLIFFE, Mr. TAFT, and Mr. THOMAS of Idaho conferees on the part of the Senate.

REPORT OF CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and referred to the Committee on Civil Service:

To the Congress of the United States:

As required by the act of Congress to regulate and improve the civil service of the United States approved January 16, 1883, I transmit herewith the sixtieth annual report of the Civil Service Com-

mission for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1943.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, December 18, 1943.

[NOTE.—The report accompanied a similar message to the House of Representatives.]

REQUISITION AND DISPOSAL OF PROPERTY REQUIRED FOR NATIONAL DEFENSE

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and, with the accompanying copy of a report, was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

To the Congress of the United States:

I am submitting herewith to the Congress a report of operations for the period April 16, 1943, through October 15, 1943 under the act of October 16, 1941, as amended, which authorized the President to requisition and dispose of property required for national defense.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, December 18, 1943.

[NOTE.—The original of this report accompanied a similar message to the House of Representatives.]

ERECTION OF MEMORIALS AND ENTOMBMENT OF BODIES IN ARLINGTON MEMORIAL AMPHITHEATER

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs:

To the Congress of the United States:

In compliance with the requirements of the Public Act No. 397, Sixty-sixth Congress, I transmit herewith the annual report of the Commission on the Erection of Memorials and Entombment of Bodies in the Arlington Memorial Amphitheater.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, December 18, 1943.

[NOTE.—The report accompanied a similar message to the House of Representatives.]

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF CERTAIN ALIENS

A letter from the Attorney General, submitting, pursuant to law, a report stating all the facts and pertinent provisions of law in the cases of 76 individuals whose deportation has been suspended for more than 6 months under authority vested in the Attorney General, together with a statement of the reasons for such suspension (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Immigration.

AMENDMENT OF SECTION 214 OF THE ACT OF FEBRUARY 28, 1925

A letter from the Postmaster General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 214 of the act of February 28, 1925 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

PERSONNEL REQUIREMENTS, COMMITTEE FOR CONGESTED PRODUCTION AREAS

A letter from the Director of the Committee for Congested Production Areas (Ex-

ecutive Office of the President), submitting a revised estimate of personnel requirements (increase of positions) for that committee for the quarter ending December 31, 1943 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Civil Service.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Mr. VANDENBERG presented the following petitions, etc., which were referred, as indicated:

A resolution adopted by the Metropolitan Council of Exchange Clubs, at Detroit, Mich., favoring the adoption of measures by Congress to continue economic stabilization and retard any further inflationary trend; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

A telegram in the nature of a petition, numerous signed, of sundry citizens of Detroit, Mich., praying for the enactment of pending food subsidy legislation; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

A resolution adopted by the Common Council of the City of Lincoln Park, Mich., favoring the enactment of pending food subsidy legislation; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

A resolution adopted by a Commission meeting at Lansing, Mich., on the 18th day of November 1943, protesting against the diversion of water from Lake Michigan by the city of Chicago greater in amount than that allowed by the Supreme Court of the United States; to the Committee on Commerce.

A resolution by the Board of Supervisors of Dickinson County, Mich., protesting against the adoption of a Federal sales tax; to the Committee on Finance.

A resolution adopted by Menominee Post No. 1887, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, favoring the enactment of legislation granting to veterans of World Wars Nos. 1 and 2 a monthly compensation of \$20 a month for veterans up to the age of 40 years; \$40 a month for veterans between the ages of 40 and 50, \$50 a month for veterans between the ages of 50 and 60, and \$60 a month for veterans over 60 years of age; to the Committee on Finance.

A resolution adopted by several Finnish organizations of Detroit, Mich., favoring a just and fair consideration of the cause of Finland; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A resolution adopted by the Jewish community of Bay City, Mich., favoring the opening of Palestine to unimpeded Jewish immigration in accordance with the Balfour Declaration; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A resolution adopted by the Munising (Mich.) Rotary Club, favoring the unrestricted immigration of Jews into Palestine; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A resolution adopted by a meeting of the Bethlehem Finnish Lutheran Congregation of Detroit, Mich., favoring a just and fair consideration of the cause of Finland; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A resolution adopted by the Board of Supervisors of Allegan County, Mich., relating to the attitude toward the Government of John L. Lewis in connection with recent coal strikes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Memorials of sundry citizens of Detroit, Mich., remonstrating against the enactment of prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A resolution by members of Local No. 600, Press Steel Executive Board, in the State of Michigan, favoring the enactment of pending anti-poli-tax legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A resolution by the Wayne University Graduate School Committee on Research, of Detroit, Mich., protesting against the enactment of pending legislation to establish an office of Scientific and Technical Mobilization; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A resolution by New York Central System Post, No. 134, American Legion, of Detroit, Mich., protesting against the use of prisoners of war in connection with work on the Nation's transportation systems; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A resolution adopted by the Common Council of Hamtramck, Mich., favoring the enactment of legislation fixing a straight 1½-cent postage rate on newspapers mailed to members of the armed forces; to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

JEWISH NATIONAL HOME IN PALESTINE

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there may be printed in the body of the RECORD, and thereafter referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, a resolution adopted at a meeting of the New Britain Zionist District, held in New Britain, Conn., on November 16, 1943. This resolution favors the establishment of a Jewish National Home in Palestine.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the Congress of the United States on June 30, 1922, adopted a resolution favoring the establishment of the Jewish National Home in Palestine; and

Whereas the interest of the United States in the development of the Jewish homeland has been evidenced in statements issued by every President since the adoption of said resolution and by numerous other Government officials and Members of Congress, and

Whereas the Jewish community of the United States in consonance with the interest displayed by the Government of the United States has given heavily of its resources and energy toward the establishment of the Jewish home in Palestine, and

Whereas the British Government has by its issuance of the White Paper on Palestine checked and endangered the development of the Jewish National Home; Be it

Resolved, That we the New Britain Jewish Community represented in this gathering here tonight request the Representatives and Senators from the State of Connecticut that they bring to the attention of the President and the State Department the great wrong and injustice caused the Jewish people by the terms of the White Paper and that our Government strongly urge upon the British Government the abrogation of the said White Paper.

NEW BRITAIN ZIONIST DISTRICT,
GEORGE L. GANS, *President*.
SAMUEL S. GVOGEL, *Secretary*.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE

The following report of a committee was submitted:

By Mr. CLARK of Missouri, from the Committee on Commerce:

H. R. 149. A bill to fix a reasonable definition and standard of identity of certain dry-milk solids; without amendment (Rept. No. 623).

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON], I submit his minority views on House bill 149, just reported by me, which I request may be printed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the minority views will be printed together with Report No. 623.

REPORT ON DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

Mr. BARKLEY, from the Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Execu-

working classes, I shall oppose it with the last breath I have.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield to me?

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes; I will yield; but first I should like to say that, of course, the joint resolution does not apply to the real question about the entry into this country of such persons. The joint resolution would merely extend the operation of the law for 31 days.

Mr. LODGE. But, Mr. President, in extending the operation of the law, of course we must give some thought as to whether the need for this type of legislation is as pressing as it was purported to be when we first enacted the law. The thought comes to my mind that a number of industrial contracts are being canceled, and that by common consent if not actually by public release from the Manpower Commission, the shortage of manpower is not so critical or so extreme as it has been.

So the whole question of the urgency of pursuing this policy should, I think, be examined de novo. To be sure, this is not the time or place to do so; but when we come to the time and place, at the end of January, I believe we should go into the question very thoroughly indeed, and should not blindly reenact a piece of legislation simply because we enacted it a year ago.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I entirely agree with the Senator. That is why I was unwilling to bring up the bill itself at this time. By the joint resolution we would merely extend the time for 31 days. I hope the Senator will remind me to instruct the clerk of the committee to give proper notice, just as soon as we return after the New Year, to call the committee together to consider the legislation. The joint resolution is merely to extend the operation of the law for 31 days.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the joint resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 209) was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

INVESTIGATION OF THE EFFECT OF THE CENTRALIZATION OF HEAVY INDUSTRY

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, on October 12 I submitted a resolution (S. Res. 190) which I now ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point, as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Resolved, That a special committee of seven Senators, to be appointed by the President of the Senate, is hereby authorized and directed to make a full and complete investigation of the effect upon interstate commerce of the centralization of heavy industry in the United States, with particular regard to whether such centralization inhibits or deters adequate use and development of natural resources or hampers the full and free flow of commerce between the States, and to make a comprehensive study of plans and proposals for industrial decentralization, particularly through establishment of new or

expanded facilities for the production of iron and steel. Such committee shall report to the Senate at the earliest practicable date the results of its investigation and study, with such recommendations for legislation as it may deem necessary and desirable, and shall also report to the Senate from time to time its views on needed or desirable executive or administrative action by any department or agency of the Federal Government.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution, the committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to hold hearings, to sit and act at such times and places during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Senate during the Seventy-eighth Congress, to employ such experts, and such clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, to request such assistance and information from any departments and agencies of the Government, to require by subpoena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such correspondence, books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, to take such testimony, and to make such expenditures, as it deems advisable. The cost of stenographic services to report such hearings shall not be in excess of 25 cents per hundred words. The expenses of the committee, which shall not exceed \$10,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, on or about November 4, the Senate Committee on Interstate Commerce filed a favorable report on the resolution. I may state offhand that the resolution is one which would seek to move heavy-commodity industry from centralized places, into places where it would be of the greatest benefit to the greatest number of persons. The purpose of the resolution is to provide opportunity for the study of the important subject whether steel should be manufactured in places where the God of nature has afforded supplies of the native commodities for the manufacture of steel, and also relative to the transportation required because of the distribution of steel commodities.

The Senate Committee on Interstate Commerce is in agreement that the resolution should be adopted. It carries a provision for an appropriation of \$25,000 from the contingent fund of the Senate, for study and investigation.

About 10 days ago the chairman of the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate voluntarily stated to me on the floor of the Senate that he would report the resolution immediately following the disposition of the bill in which he was then interested, which was the soldiers' vote bill. He made the same statement to other Senators. We are now about to conclude the work of this session, and yet the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, presided over by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. Lucas] has not made a report on this all-important resolution.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. McCARRAN. I shall be glad to yield in a moment.

Not only is the resolution supported by a distinguished group in the Senate, but meetings have been held between the group in the Senate and the group in the

House who are interested in the building of a great nation for the future.

I now yield to the Senator from Utah.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President, I should like to make a few observations in connection with the remarks of the distinguished Senator from Nevada.

In the past 3 years, in furtherance of the war program, our country has spent billions of dollars in the construction of plants throughout the United States. Among them are many steel plants which have been constructed at places where there is an abundance of iron ore and an abundance of coking coal.

I invite the attention of the Senate to the fact that today there is a trend—I do not know where it originated, nor do I know by whom it was initiated, but just as sure as we are standing here the trend has begun—to cut down those plants and to continue the production of steel in the large centralizations which now exist.

I commend the Senator now, as I have done in the past, on the submission of his resolution. In my opinion, no committee of the Senate is today in a position to do a greater service to the country than the committee of which the Senator speaks. It seems to me that now is the opportune time for that committee to get under way and render the great service to the Nation which it can render.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I am very grateful to my colleague from Utah, who understands and advocates the cause of the great section of the West from which we both come.

Mr. President, there is a movement on foot to destroy, if possible, the development of the natural resources of this country and initially to defeat this resolution. I know what is going on. I know that in my State there is the greatest magnesium plant in all the world. It has produced more magnesium, which is a war essential, than any other single plant in all the world. I know that magnesium is a commodity which is competitive with aluminum. I know that today certain interests are seeking to shut down that plant. I have in my office a copy of a letter from an individual in authority in a high place in America who would shut down the basic magnesium plant at Las Vegas, Nev., under the guise of saving fuel, when the basic magnesium plant at Las Vegas, Nev., uses only electrical energy, rather than fuel oil. So all kinds of excuses are being made by those who have been placed in positions of power in the War Production Board and other agencies to hold back the development of America.

The development of America does not mean the development of certain points in America. The development of America means the development of all America—from the Atlantic to the Pacific; from the Canadian border to the Gulf; and into Alaska and other Territorial possessions.

There are those who would control this development for their own selfish interests. Mr. President, I sincerely hope that there is nothing sinister behind the deferment of the adoption of the report by the Committee on Interstate Com-

merce, headed by the able Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER] with reference to Senate Resolution 190.

I ask unanimous consent that the report of the Committee on Interstate Commerce approving the provisions of Senate Resolution 190, be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the report (No. 519) was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The Committee on Interstate Commerce, to whom was referred the resolution (S. Res. 190) to investigate the effect of the centralization of heavy industry in the United States, after full consideration, without dissent report favorably thereon, with an amendment, and recommend that the resolution, as amended, do pass.

The amendment proposed is as follows:

Page 2, line 21, strike out "\$10,000," and insert "\$5,000."

One of the important problems presented for the attention of the Congress is the problem of a proper use of our natural resources. This is true not only in relation to post-war planning, where it is a vital factor, but also now, while the war is in progress, because it is important to the conduct of the war.

Much of this country's expansion for war production has ignored such basic factors as the location of resources, and has followed what appears to have been the line of least resistance; that is, augmentation and expansion of facilities already in existence. Whether this policy has prevented the country from reaching its maximum potentialities in various lines of production, and how much this policy has contributed to transportation bottlenecks, are questions of great importance.

These questions, and others proposed for consideration by the committee, which this resolution would create, are so broad in scope, and embrace so many factors related to the economic development of various sections of the country, and of the country as a whole, that your committee deems it proper they should be the subject of inquiry by a special committee of the Senate.

Of immediate concern is the fact that shortages of scrap, of iron ore, and of steel continue serious. The war needs of the country for steel have been reported as more than 25 percent in excess of production. Yet vast natural resources for steel production remain unexploited.

The following table, based on information furnished by the United States Bureau of Mines, shows one phase of this situation State by State:

| State | Has coal | Has iron ore | Produces iron or steel |
|---------------|----------|--------------|------------------------|
| Alabama | X | X | X |
| Arizona | X | X | |
| Arkansas | X | X | |
| California | X | X | X |
| Colorado | X | X | X |
| Connecticut | | X | X |
| Delaware | | | |
| Florida | | | |
| Georgia | X | X | X |
| Idaho | X | X | |
| Illinois | X | | X |
| Indiana | X | | X |
| Iowa | X | X | |
| Kansas | X | | |
| Kentucky | X | X | X |
| Louisiana | | | |
| Maine | | | |
| Maryland | X | X | X |
| Massachusetts | | X | X |
| Michigan | X | X | X |
| Minnesota | | X | X |
| Mississippi | | X | |
| Missouri | X | X | X |
| Montana | X | X | |
| Nebraska | | | |
| Nevada | X | X | |

| State | Has coal | Has iron ore | Produces iron or steel |
|----------------|----------|--------------|------------------------|
| New Hampshire | | | |
| New Jersey | | X | X |
| New Mexico | X | X | |
| New York | | X | X |
| North Carolina | X | X | |
| North Dakota | X | | |
| Ohio | X | X | X |
| Oklahoma | X | X | |
| Oregon | X | | |
| Pennsylvania | X | X | X |
| Rhode Island | | | |
| South Carolina | | | |
| South Dakota | X | X | |
| Tennessee | X | X | |
| Texas | X | X | X |
| Utah | X | X | X |
| Vermont | | | |
| Virginia | X | X | X |
| Washington | X | X | X |
| West Virginia | X | X | |
| Wisconsin | | X | |
| Wyoming | X | X | |

It will be noted that known coal deposits are to be found in 32 States, while iron ore in usable quantity and quality is known to exist in 34 States. Twenty-seven States have both iron ore and coal, but only 13 of these States have any iron or steel production. On the other hand, 7 of the States which now produce iron or steel lack, as a part of their natural resources, either coal or iron ore.

Many States which do produce iron or steel produce so little that their contribution to the total national output is almost inconsiderable. It is a question which should have the attention of the Congress whether those States whose production now is so small should not, through some coordinated program, be given opportunity to achieve a substantial expansion of this industry, so as to attain whatever place in the national picture should be theirs on the basis of their natural resources.

As to the States which have both iron ore and natural coal deposits, in usable quantity and quality, but which produce no iron or steel, it is a proper subject of inquiry whether any factors other than natural economic laws are hampering or preventing establishment in such States of such facilities for iron and steel production as their natural resources justify.

Centralization of industry can be a self-perpetuating economic factor. To whatever extent it is self-perpetuating, rather than dictated by the more basic factors such as resources, transportation, and labor supply, it is unsound and detrimental to the national economy. The importance, to the Senate, of having the full and true facts regarding this situation, in the United States, is obvious. Such facts are basic to a proper consideration of the problems incident to the post-war planning which is and must be the responsibility of the Congress.

The Senate should have no hesitancy in authorizing a special committee to secure these facts, to study their implications, and to make sound recommendations for dealing with the complicated problems involved. For a proper discharge of its duties, the Senate must have such facts and such recommendations, and it should not be required to rely, in this regard, upon any outside source.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I do not propose to give up in this matter. There is no power on earth to which I am subservient save my God and my country. I propose that this resolution shall be kept before the Senate, either at this session or in the session to come. If the chairman of the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, after having voluntarily given

me his word, and given his word to other Members of the Senate, that he would report the resolution, now proposes to hold it in abeyance, then I shall keep it before the Senate, because I believe in the justice of my cause. Otherwise, I would have no cause. I have never presented a matter to the Senate in which I did not believe in my very soul.

RECESS

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I have received information that the House has agreed to the conference report on the extension of the life of the Commodity Credit Corporation. The message from the House is on its way to the Senate. I expect it to be here in a few minutes. I therefore ask that the Senate stand in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

There being no objection, the Senate (at 3 o'clock and 50 minutes p. m.) took a recess subject to the call of the Chair.

The Senate reassembled at 3 o'clock and 55 minutes, when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. TUNNELL in the chair).

AUTHORIZATION TO SIGN BILLS, ETC.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that during the impending recess of the Senate the Vice President be authorized to sign bills and resolutions ready for signature; that the Secretary of the Senate be authorized to receive messages from the House of Representatives, and that the committees be authorized to report to the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 103) continuing the Commodity Credit Corporation as an agency of the United States.

CONTINUATION OF COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. BARKLEY submitted the following report:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 103) continuing the Commodity Credit Corporation as an agency of the United States, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows: That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the House amendment insert the following: "February 17, 1944"; and the House agree to the same.

ALBEN W. BARKLEY,
FRANCIS MALONEY,
GEORGE L. RADCLIFFE,
JOHN THOMAS,

Managers on the part of the Senate.

BRENT SPENCE,
THOMAS F. FORD,
PAUL BROWN,
WRIGHT PATMAN,
CHARLES L. GIFFORD,
FRED L. CRAWFORD,

Managers on the part of the House.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the conference report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the question is on agreeing to the report.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, what is the effect of the agreement?

Mr. BARKLEY. The conferees agreed on the 17th day of February as the date to which the life of the Commodity Credit Corporation should be continued, which is an exact middle date between the 5th and 29th of February, the dates fixed by the House and Senate, respectively.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

FINAL ADJOURNMENT OF THE TWO HOUSES

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I submit a concurrent resolution, and ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read the concurrent resolution.

The legislative clerk read the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 29) as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the two Houses of Congress shall adjourn on Tuesday, December 21, 1943, and that when they adjourn on said day they stand adjourned sine die.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the concurrent resolution?

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution was considered, and agreed to.

DATE OF MEETING OF SECOND SESSION OF SEVENTY-EIGHTH CONGRESS

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may introduce a joint resolution, and that the Senate proceed to consider it at this time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 105) fixing the date of meeting of the second session of the Seventy-eighth Congress, was read the first time by its title and the second time at length, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the second session of the Seventy-eighth Congress shall begin at noon on Monday, January 10, 1944.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, for some reason or other unknown to the members of the committee, this matter was submitted to the Appropriations Committee, and we amended the measure presented so that the second session of the Seventy-eighth Congress would commence on the 19th of January. I believe that was in conformity with the desire of the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. McNARY].

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator has reference to a joint resolution introduced by the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] and referred to the Committee on Appropriations. As usual, the procedure in matters of that sort is

worked out between the two Houses of Congress, and in this case there has been agreement with the majority and minority leaders of the other House, as well as with the Members on the other side of the Senate.

Mr. McCARRAN. It is customary, I take it, for such questions to be submitted to the Appropriations Committee. Naturally, that committee has the matter of appropriations under its jurisdiction and knows the situation.

Mr. BARKLEY. I have no recollection of any occasion when a resolution of that sort was submitted by a Senator prior to an agreement between the two Houses as to when there should be an adjournment and reassembly. I make no question of the propriety of the reference of the resolution, but obviously it is a matter which has to be worked out, and it has been worked out in connection with the joint resolution now pending.

I thank the Senator for calling it to my attention.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 105) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate now proceed to consider executive business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TUNNELL in the chair) laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the calendar.

THE PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Public Health Service.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask that the nominations in the Public Health Service be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Public Health Service nominations are confirmed en bloc.

THE MARINE CORPS

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Alexander A. Vandegrift to be Commandant of the Marine Corps with the rank of lieutenant general.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Merritt A. Edson to be brigadier general in the Marine Corps for temporary service.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask that the President be notified of all nominations this day confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

RECESS TO TUESDAY

Mr. BARKLEY. I now move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon on Tuesday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock p. m.) the Senate took a recess until Tuesday, December 21, 1943, at 12 o'clock noon.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate December 18 (legislative day of December 15), 1943:

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

J. Brock Havron, of Tennessee, to be a Foreign Service officer, unclassified, a vice consul of career, and a secretary in the Diplomatic Service of the United States of America.

David C. Berger, of Virginia, now a Foreign Service officer of class 4 and a secretary in the Diplomatic Service, to be also a consul general of the United States of America.

William D. Moreland, Jr., of Oregon, now a Foreign Service officer of class 7 and a secretary in the Diplomatic Service, to be also a consul of the United States of America.

COLLECTOR OF INTERNAL REVENUE

Denis W. Delaney, of Lawrence, Mass., to be collector of internal revenue for the district of Massachusetts, in place of Thomas B. Hassett, resigned.

COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS

Alden H. Baker, of Noblesville, Ind., to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 40, with headquarters at Indianapolis, Ind., in place of Charles E. Kemper, deceased.

IN THE MARINE CORPS

Col. William P. T. Hill to be the Quartermaster of the Marine Corps, with the rank of brigadier general, for a period of 4 years from the 1st day of February 1944.

Col. William J. Wallace to be a brigadier general in the Marine Corps, for temporary service, from the 5th day of December 1943.

Col. Thomas J. Cushman to be a brigadier general in the Marine Corps, for temporary service, from the 7th day of December 1943.

POSTMASTERS

The following-named persons to be postmasters:

ALABAMA

Katherine D. Wright, Auburn, Ala., in place of Homer Wright, deceased.

CALIFORNIA

Joseph L. Hewes, Encinitas, Calif., in place of R. J. Homan, removed.

Alice L. West, Rocklin, Calif. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

DELAWARE

Florence E. Williams, Dagsboro, Del., in place of Elmer Layfield. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Otto Dickerson, Milton, Del., in place of F. H. Carey. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Edna E. Conner, Townsend, Del., in place of E. A. Conner. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

FLORIDA

Jennie D. Carlton, Nocatee, Fla. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

GEORGIA

Katherine F. Underwood, Cadwell, Ga., in place of B. B. Hicks, resigned.

Durell W. Knight, Dexter, Ga. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Edgar F. Allen, Folkston, Ga., in place of V. J. Pickren, resigned.

Bob H. Elliott, Milledale, Ga. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Julia E. Custer, Montrose, Ga. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Marie E. Harrell, Pearson, Ga., in place of Harley Davis, transferred.

Charles P. Suber, Ben Hill, Ga. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Hubert H. Watson, Warner Robins, Ga. Office became Presidential October 1, 1942.

HAWAII

Francis K. C. Foo, Kailua, Hawaii. Office became Presidential July 1, 1938.

IDAHO

Claus J. Breier, Jr., Lewiston, Idaho, in place of Fred Kling, deceased.

INDIANA

Joshua Rothrock, Brooklyn, Ind. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Frank A. Anderson, Deputy, Ind. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Madelyn O'Dell, Fillmore, Ind. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Dale E. Pherigo, Flat Rock, Ind. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Willard W. Goble, Freetown, Ind. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Leta McComb, Hometown, Ind. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Louisa E. Rainford, Lake Village, Ind. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

Lester A. Madden, Lynnvill, Ind. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Winnie Johnson, North Terre Haute, Ind. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Andy Dillon, Otwell, Ind. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

James H. Witherspoon, Sr., Patoka, Ind. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Leonora T. Anderson, Poland, Ind. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Ruth Kennedy, St. Bernice, Ind. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Grace Mitchell, Springfield, Ind. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Harold T. Conrad, Zionsville, Ind., in place of P. R. Moore, transferred.

IOWA

A. Woodruff Moore, Onawa, Iowa, in place of Ben Jensen, retired.

Mildred L. Thoreen, University Park, Iowa, in place of L. C. Hewitt, resigned.

KANSAS

Clarence F. Danielson, Clyde, Kans., in place of J. J. Menard, transferred.

Roy W. Sanderson, Hamilton, Kans., in place of Otis Barngrover, transferred.

Paul D. Randel, Havensville, Kans., in place of W. T. Flowers, transferred.

Philip P. Voran, Kinsley, Kans., in place of W. C. Reeder, resigned.

Caleb A. Bodmer, Natoma, Kans., in place of A. V. Hoskins, not commissioned.

May B. Lawson, Plains, Kans., in place of N. W. Woodworth, transferred.

Clifford I. Percival, Smolan, Kans. Office became Presidential October 1, 1942.

G. Lowell Kelley, White Cloud, Kans. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

KENTUCKY

James A. Usher, Farmington, Ky. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Elizabeth Godsey, Hardburly, Ky. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

James L. Howard, Kings Mountain, Ky. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Mary H. Buckler, Loretto, Ky. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Arnold E. Adkins, Raceland, Ky. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Thelma Chloe Howard, Summer Shade, Ky. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

LOUISIANA

Willie A. Dearman, Delhi, La., in place of J. W. Stegall, transferred.

Edith W. Ott, Fisher, La., in place of F. H. Wootton, resigned.

Anatole E. Ayo, Jr., Lockport, La., in place of Conrad Bourgeois. Incumbent's commission expired February 18, 1941.

Pauline M. Netterville, Newellton, La., in place of A. B. Netterville. Incumbent's commission expired May 6, 1942.

MAINE

Verna G. Clark, Albion, Maine. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Lester G. Sands, Bar Mills, Maine. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Katherine C. Duntley, Casco, Maine. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

MARYLAND

Emma B. Gardner, Arnold, Md. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

William E. Bowman, Silver Spring, Md., in place of Howard Griffith, deceased.

MASSACHUSETTS

Hester L. Sherman, Brimfield, Mass., in place of J. W. Brown, deceased.

MISSOURI

Stephen H. Biggerstaff, Wheeling, Mo. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

MONTANA

David R. Bowen, Worden, Mont., in place of D. R. Bowen. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

NEBRASKA

George W. Lincoln, Lexington, Nebr., in place of P. J. Hewitt. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

NEVADA

William Harold Morgan, Yerington, Nev., in place of E. M. Booth, removed.

NEW HAMPSHIRE

Edward Reilly, Dover, N. H., in place of J. J. Cavanaugh, removed.

Walter E. French, Dublin, N. H., in place of F. B. Farley, resigned.

Julia W. Blair, Fitzwilliam, N. H. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

George G. Helsberg, New Ipswich, N. H. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Ralph E. Avery, West Campton, N. H. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

NEW JERSEY

Almira C. Goff, Bridgeport, N. J. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Edna M. Bowen, Franklin Park, N. J. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Thomas L. Hunt, Greystone Park, N. J., in place of W. J. Dugan, removed.

Lena McCain, Hope, N. J. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

NEW YORK

Clyde M. Johengen, Collins, N. Y. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

Charles J. Jones, Garnerville, N. Y., in place of F. P. Morstatt, deceased.

Mary T. Mushler, Rocky Point, N. Y., in place of A. R. Cardona, resigned.

Anne N. Cisler, Stillwater, N. Y., in place of W. H. Nolan, deceased.

NORTH CAROLINA

Clara C. Craven, Trinity, N. C. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

OHIO

James E. Rosser, McArthur, Ohio, in place of J. E. Warren, deceased.

Albert N. Weckerly, Whitehouse, Ohio, in place of D. K. Studer, resigned.

OREGON

Gertrude K. McKinney, Elkton, Oreg., in place of A. R. McDonald, resigned.

Dorothy V. Elliott, Florence, Oreg., in place of E. L. Basford, resigned.

Clinton F. Trow, Ontario, Oreg., in place of C. F. Cox, deceased.

PENNSYLVANIA

Jane F. Mackley, Bainbridge, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Arthur R. Lovell, Blandburg, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Besse C. Pepper, Boiling Springs, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Donald A. Noll, Bowmanstown, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Beulah McConnell, Clinton, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Julia M. Fuleki, Commodore, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Catherine Matlock, Cumbola, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Kermit E. Reisenweaver, Drums, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Walter R. Weir, Floreffe, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Charles W. Staley, Plymouth Meeting, Pa., in place of E. A. Howell, resigned.

Walter C. Starinshak, Ranshaw, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Lafayette Lawrence, Renfrew, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Arzella A. Plummer, Sidman, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Frank O. Shenton, Slatedale, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Katherine M. Evans, Springville, Pa., in place of M. L. Lake, resigned.

Grace E. Strattan, Strattanville, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Ruth A. Groover, Upper Black Eddy, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Emma E. Foster, Wall, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Elizabeth N. Nolt, Willow Street, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

PUERTO RICO

Angel Socorro, Caguas, P. R., in place of Augustin Carbonell, retired.

Tomas S. Gutierrez, San Sebastian, P. R., in place of J. V. Hernandez, retired.

SOUTH CAROLINA

Grover C. Henderson, Greenwood, S. C., in place of G. N. Burnett. Incumbent's commission expired June 8, 1942.

James N. Cleveland, Marietta, S. C. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Thomas M. Moore, Rembert, S. C. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

SOUTH DAKOTA

Clarence R. Dregseth, Baltic, S. Dak. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Alton B. Nelson, Toronto, S. Dak., in place of O. I. Ohman. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

TENNESSEE

Edgar M. Quisenberry, Atoka, Tenn. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Mattie Ida O'Brien, Christiansburg, Tenn. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

TEXAS

Claud S. Campbell, Borger, Tex., in place of J. E. Morris, resigned.

Thomas L. P. Lindley, Fairfield, Tex., in place of Lonnie Childs, retired.

Stella Gilddon, Johnson City, Tex., in place of C. C. Redford, retired.

Fannie E. Taylor, Murchison, Tex. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Marion J. Edwards, Rankin, Tex., in place of A. J. Bushong, retired.

Robert E. Johnson, Round Rock, Tex., in place of J. W. Ledbetter, transferred.

UTAH

Etta Moffitt, Kenilworth, Utah. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

THE WRIGHT BROTHERS

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?
There was no objection.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, December 17, marked the fortieth anniversary of the first airplane flight. The people of North Carolina, led by the Governor of the State, had prepared exercises to be held at Kill Devil Hill, on the coast of North Carolina in Dare County commemorating this great event. Unfortunately the weather prevailed against the great State of North Carolina and the people, and the exercises necessarily had to be canceled, due to an unprecedented sleet and snow storm. As chairman of the arrangement committee I invited to these exercises the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JEFFREY], who has the honor to represent the district that Mr. Wright lives in. There had also been invited the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GRIFFITHS], the North Carolina delegation, and certain other Members of Congress. It was a great disappointment.

Last night, Mr. Speaker, there was held in Washington an outstanding event, a great banquet given in honor of Mr. Wright—the first aviator. The plane now in England is to be returned to America, and I hope, Mr. Speaker, it will be placed at Kitty Hawk, in the monument commemorating this great accomplishment.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include in my remarks an address made by the Honorable Lindsey C. Warren, the Comptroller General of the United States, a former Member of this House. At a future date, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the address which would have been given by the Governor of North Carolina at Kitty Hawk, be also included in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?
There was no objection.

[The matter referred to appears in the Appendix.]

COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk Senate Joint Resolution 103 continuing the Commodity Credit Corporation as an agency of the United States, with a House amendment, that the House insist on its amendment and agree to the conference requested by the Senate.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate joint resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Chair appoints the following conferees: Mr. SPENCE, Mr. FORD, Mr. BROWN of Georgia, Mr. PATMAN, Mr. WOLCOTT, Mr. GIFFORD, and Mr. CRAWFORD.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?
There was no objection.

[The matter referred to appears in the Appendix.]

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an address delivered by Dr. E. S. Longacre at the Masonic Temple in Detroit, Mich., under date of December 11.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?
There was no objection.

[The matter referred to will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a letter from one of my constituents.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?
There was no objection.

[The matter referred to appears in the Appendix.]

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial on our distinguished colleague the gentleman from North Carolina, Hon. ROBERT L. DOUGHTON.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?
There was no objection.

[The matter referred to appears in the Appendix.]

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks on two subjects, one including an article on the Bonneville Dam and the other including a certain resolution adopted in my district.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?
There was no objection.

[The matter referred to appears in the Appendix.]

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that today, at the conclusion of other special orders, the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HORAN] may address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?
There was no objection.

INDUCTION OF MEN INTO THE ARMED FORCES DURING THE CHRISTMAS SEASON

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?
There was no objection.

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. Speaker, I have been informed that boys who were inducted into the Army of the United States under the Selective Service System on December 1, 2, and 3 are about to be taken from their homes into the camps of the Army on the very eve of Christmas. I have addressed a communication on this subject and have talked in person to the proper Army authorities and have asked them to defer until after Christmas the actual transportation of these men from their homes to the camps for this reason. Many of these men are fathers of small children. It seems an unnecessarily in-

humane thing at this time on the very eve of Christmas to take these men from their families of small children and put them into the Army of the United States. Certainly 2 or 3 days' postponement of the actual date of the transfer of these men will not materially affect the training of these men or the cause of the United States.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

RECESS

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it may be in order that any time during the day for the Speaker to declare a recess subject to the call of the Chair.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, does that provide for interruption of the program? I notice there are some special orders.

Mr. RAMSPECK. That will be subject to the order of the Speaker, of course.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I do not think they want to interrupt any special orders. This is simply to provide for a recess while we may wait on the Senate for some action.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will recognize all members, who have special orders before he declares any recess.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I do not know what the program is, but the Senate has just passed the discharge pay bill for the men in the armed forces. It is my hope that we may take that bill up by unanimous consent when it is messaged here and put it on passage today. I want to serve notice now that I am going to oppose any adjournment over the holidays until that measure is disposed of.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Georgia has made a simple request; that is that when the business before the House is concluded and while we are waiting on other important matters that may come from the Senate, the Chair be privileged to declare a recess. The Chair does not think that should be controversial. If it is, let somebody object.

Mr. RAMSPECK. I demand the regular order.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. RAMSPECK]?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that, after the business of the day and such special orders as may be on the Speaker's desk, I may be privileged to address the House for 15 minutes on a report from the Subcommittee on Appropriations.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include an excerpt from the magazine Flying, and a brief letter; also, to extend my remarks and to include an editorial from the Washington Post.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

[The matter referred to appears in the Appendix.]

RATIONING OF PORK AND PORK PRODUCTS

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, the rationing of pork should be discontinued for at least 2 weeks. That would relieve the congestion in the markets and in the storage houses.

I have received a telegram from a meat-processing concern in my district, which I want to read:

Great hog supply and consumer inability to purchase because of limited points is causing serious emergency. Cold-storage space unavailable. O. P. A. and W. F. A. deny relief. We earnestly urge your influence to obtain 10-day emergency point-free period on fresh pork.

Action should be taken by the O. P. A. to relieve the situation. To do otherwise is unfair to farmers, packers, processors, and the consumers.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and to include two editorials from the Bay City Times, of Bay City, Mich.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? There was no objection.

[The matter referred to will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

CORRECTION OF THE RECORD

Mr. LAFOLLETTE. Mr. Speaker, On December 15 I was granted unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute. In that address I inadvertently stated that the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. MILLER] was not present when I addressed the House on December 13. I was mistaken in that statement in that the gentleman was in the back of the Chamber and I did not see him. I ask unanimous consent that the first sentence in the second paragraph of my remarks, where they appear on page 10808 of the RECORD be therefore corrected in the permanent RECORD to read as follows:

I addressed the House on December 13 on this subject, but the gentleman from Connecticut, although present, did not have my revised and extended remarks of that date before him at the time he addressed the House on the insurance legislation on December 14, but only the extension that appeared in the Appendix on December 9 at page 5770.

I have presented this correction to the gentleman from Connecticut and I am authorized by him to say that it meets his approval. Therefore I ask unanimous consent that the correction above noted be made in the permanent RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the correction will be made.

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD, and include a resolution.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

[The matter referred to will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that upon the conclusion of the other special orders today I may be permitted to speak for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and to include two letters from American Legion officials.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? There was no objection.

[The matter referred to will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point and to include certain extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? There was no objection.

LET US PROVIDE DECENT BURIAL FOR OUR SOLDIER DEAD

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to bills introduced by Senator McNARY and myself the Congress enacted Public Law 388, Seventy-seventh Congress, first session, which was approved by the President December 29, 1941, and which reads as follows:

S. 793

An act to provide for a national cemetery in the vicinity of Portland, Oreg.

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of War is authorized and directed to establish and maintain, in accordance with the provisions of law governing national cemeteries, a national cemetery in the vicinity of Portland, Oreg. The Secretary of War is authorized to acquire by donation, purchase, condemnation, or otherwise such suitable lands as are in his judgment necessary for the establishment and maintenance of such cemetery.

Sec. 2. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sums as may be necessary for the purposes of this act. Approved, December 29, 1941.

The Secretary of War is authorized, under the terms of this law, to acquire by purchase, condemnation, or otherwise such suitable lands as are in his judgment necessary for the establish-

ment and maintenance of such a cemetery. At the present time there is great need for such a cemetery. Existing facilities are wholly inadequate to care for the burial of veterans in the Northwest area. The Federal Government had a plot set aside in the Lincoln Memorial Cemetery in Portland for the burial of deceased veterans, but this plot is fully occupied. The State of Oregon purchased adjoining land a few years ago to provide facilities for veterans' burial which was intended for a limited time only, which is now entirely inadequate. Funds are not sufficient to maintain this plot adequately and to provide for the increasing number of burials of veterans made necessary by deaths in this locality, including many from World War No. 2.

The nearest veterans' cemetery is south of San Francisco, a thousand or fifteen hundred miles distant from the various portions of the territory which will be served by a veterans' cemetery in Portland. This cemetery would give burial facilities for veterans from the State of Oregon and adjoining territory in which there are no facilities for burials in a national cemetery, in which there are at the present time approximately 155,000 veterans of the various wars, as shown by the following tabulation:

There are in the State of Oregon 41,219 World War veterans, 41 Civil War veterans, 47 Indian war veterans, 2,673 Spanish-American War veterans, and 398 peacetime veterans. In the State of Washington there are 64,999 World War veterans, 46 Civil War veterans, 65 Indian War veterans, 4,169 Spanish-American War veterans, and 747 peacetime veterans. Idaho has 15,457 World War veterans, 11 Civil War veterans, 19 Indian war veterans, 672 Spanish-American War veterans, and 103 peacetime veterans. Montana has 20,610 World War veterans, 5 Civil War veterans, 75 Indian war veterans, 892 Spanish-American War veterans, and 148 peacetime veterans. The figures for Alaska are a total of 2,500. In the above States there are a total of 142,285 World War veterans, 103 Civil War veterans, 206 Indian war veterans, 8,406 Spanish-American War veterans, and 1,396 peacetime veterans. The total number of veterans in the above territory is 154,896.

The average age of the World War veterans is 48; Spanish-American War veterans, 69; Civil War, 96; Indian war, 81. It is estimated that a total of 103 World War veterans die each day; Spanish-American War veterans at the rate of 24 a day; Civil War, 3 a day; and Indian war, 1 a day. These figures are the 1940 rate. There are approximately 4,000,000 World War veterans surviving, 159,230 Spanish-American War veterans, 2,381 Civil War veterans, and 2,216 Indian war veterans. In applying the death rate proportionately to the number of World War, Spanish, Indian, and Civil War veterans residing in the Northwest, there are approximately 4 $\frac{2}{3}$ deaths per day. This figure does not take into consideration the peacetime

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, on the proposition to provide \$650,000 for the agricultural census, the House receded.

On the Bureau of Reclamation and water conservation projects, as I have explained in my colloquy with the gentleman from South Dakota, \$1,000,000 was allowed.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. MURDOCK. Did I understand the gentleman in reply to the gentleman from South Dakota a few minutes ago to say that \$1,000,000 is the total provided for this reclamation but that there is no indicated division as to whether \$800,000 is for surveys?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. No; there is no change in the verbiage of the provision; the \$800,000 provision still stands.

Mr. MURDOCK. That is that \$800,000 is the top limit for surveys in this work?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. That is right, but a total of \$1,000,000 is appropriated for the purposes of the amendment.

On the McKellar amendment the Senate receded. The last amendment was merely a correction of a section number.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, the chairman has described the provisions of the conference report. I just want to say that I yielded to the \$7,500,000 for Farm Security to make loans because that was the only way we could get a bill. It is not as big an amount as it might be and yet it is \$7,500,000 wasted if they continue to operate the way they have operated in the past. They have interfered with farm production and the production of food by putting people who were not competent to farm, putting considerable numbers of them on farms. Instead of being a help to the food production program they have been a menace.

I do want to say this so that the House will know that we did not do so terribly bad. On this last conference the Senate yielded on amendments which total \$143,000,000, including \$30,000,000 for the Farm Security. The House yielded to the Senate on amendments put in by the Senate and left them in the bill at this conference today to the extent of \$9,350,000. The House yielded on items it had in the bill which the Senate had stricken out to the tune of \$739,000. I thought the House ought to have that picture to realize that we really had represented them to the very best of our ability.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. JENSEN. I want to compliment the conferees of the House on the fine job they have done. This is something unusual, to cut the Senate down. The thing I wanted to know specifically was how much money there is in this bill for reclamation investigation?

Mr. TABER. There is \$1,000,000 for operations under the Wheeler-Case Act. There is a limitation that not more than \$800,000 may be expended for investigations. They can expend at most \$800,000 for investigations or they can spend none of it according to what the department concludes to do.

Mr. JENSEN. According to that, then, there is \$1,800,000 in this bill for reclamation.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. No; the total is \$1,000,000.

Mr. JENSEN. A \$1,000,000 total?

Mr. TABER. Yes; and of that million they may if they choose expend \$800,000 for investigations or they may expend the whole \$1,000,000 on the construction of projects.

Mr. JENSEN. I think the matter was handled in a very fine manner.

Mr. TABER. Frankly, the House conferees have done the best they could. They worked hard. We were in session for nearly 3 hours and I think we did as well as we could under all the circumstances.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, unless some other Member desires to discuss the report, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The conference report was agreed to. A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENDING UNTIL JANUARY 31, 1944, THE PROVISIONS OF THE ACT OF APRIL 29, 1943

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of House Joint Resolution 209, extending until January 31, 1944, the provisions of the act of April 29, 1943, making an appropriation to assist in providing a supply and distribution of farm labor for the calendar year 1943.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the act of April 29, 1943 (Public Law 45), making an appropriation to assist in providing a supply and distribution of farm labor for the calendar year 1943, is hereby amended by striking out the date "December 31, 1943" in section 1 and inserting in lieu thereof "January 31, 1944," and is further amended so that the funds appropriated by section 1 and not heretofore or hereafter apportioned by the Administrator among the several States pursuant to section 2 shall be available for expenditure by the Administrator for the purposes specified in section 3.

Sec. 2. Notwithstanding any provisions to the contrary in the act approved July 12, 1943 (Public Law 132), funds available to the War Manpower Commission for the current migration of Mexican or Canadian nationals under the auspices of the War Manpower Commission for industrial and railroad purposes essential to the war effort may continue to be expended during the fiscal year 1944.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I shall not, I wish to ask the chairman a question. This resolution, Mr. Speaker, as I understand, and I will ask the chairman to correct me if I am wrong, is an extension of the provisions of the present Farm Labor Act that we passed last April, extending that act until the 31st day of

January 1944, so that those laborers who have been brought in from foreign countries and are now here who are so urgently needed in California, Florida, and some other places at the present time, will not have to be sent back home because of the expiration of the act. It simply makes available until the 31st day of January 1944, unexpended balances of the \$26,500,000, reallocating the funds to a certain extent where it may be necessary so that it may work. Is that the picture as the chairman understands it?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from New York has outlined the situation correctly.

The difficulty arises due to the fact that this appropriation is not for the fiscal year but for the calendar year which expires on December 31.

The House passed a bill and sent it over to the Senate to take care of the situation but due to the fact that it cannot reach consideration in the Senate by January 1, it becomes necessary to pass this continuing resolution.

This resolution is necessary for two reasons: In the first place under this law we have considerable foreign labor in the country. We have labor from Mexico, from the Bahamas, and elsewhere, and would be faced with the alternative either of immediately taking them from the jobs where they are so desperately needed and sending them out of the country by the 31st of the month, or leaving them in the country wholly unsupervised.

Mr. TABER. And it is a fact, is it not, that the Senate Committee on Appropriations is absolutely unable to take this up before the 1st of January?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. We are advised by the members of the Senate committee that they are unable to take it up and it is necessary, therefore, to ask a continuation of the present law without change for 30 days to be financed with unexpended funds still available. These funds aggregate about \$6,750,000. Of this six or seven million dollars, about three is available for the placement of interstate labor under the Extension Service and about \$4,000,000 for use by the Food Administrator for the recruitment and placement of foreign labor.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I ask the gentleman from Missouri if there has been any change in the situation since he told me yesterday that after the passage of this resolution there would, in the gentleman's opinion, be sufficient funds to continue the operation of the farm-labor camps?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. There are ample funds to continue them for the period covered by this continuing resolution.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I understood the gentleman to say that the Farm Security Administration would continue to administer the work of these farm camps, is that correct?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. No. The War Food Administration handles the camps.

Mr. ROBERTSON. The War Food Administration?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Under our former colleague, Judge Marvin Jones.

Mr. ROBERTSON. And he will continue to do so?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Exactly as heretofore.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. The money appropriated in the bill that is here appropriated is to keep these folks in the country in some kind of camp so that they may be available when the work comes up for them?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. These men are already in the country and under employment at the present time. This will enable us to keep them on the job instead of having to send them back home before December 31.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Why is it necessary to send them home?

Mr. TABER. If the gentleman from Missouri will yield, I will answer that by saying that it would be necessary to send them home because it is absolutely impossible to get the bill which we considered here yesterday through the Congress before the 1st of January and there will be no recourse left to the officers in the Department except to send them home if their funds were definitely going to be out the first of the year. There are 40,000 of them, or a little better, actually working in California at the present time and two or three thousand Bahamans actually working on the citrus-fruit crops in Florida.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I see no reason why these laborers could not stay here. I think the committee and the House should bear in mind these men have come here in the past without any assistance from the Federal Government because there were ample wages and attractive wages for them in this country. We have always had from 40,000 to 50,000 men from south of the Rio Grande come into the United States as laborers. I noticed yesterday a statement from the Labor Department that before the end of 1944 there would be 2,000,000 men in the United States without jobs. I think this Congress ought to bear in mind the fact some of these 2,000,000 men may be returning soldiers and they will need a job instead of bringing people in from Mexico and the Bahamas to carry on this work. I hope we can see the end of this kind of program of subsidizing the workers of other countries. They come in anyway. Later on we are going to need these jobs for men in our own country.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. These men could not be brought in ordinarily due to the operation of the immigration laws. They have been brought in by the Government under every safeguard. They are Bertilloned and fingerprinted. We are under contract to return them as soon as the work period is completed. There

can be no doubt or delay about their prompt return to their own country.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON]?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to ask the gentleman a question as long as this is not brought in so that we get a chance to read it. Is the provision in there that any of these men can go from their countries without the O. K. of the county agricultural agent?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. There is no change in the law.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. May I say to the gentleman that I regret we did not have an opportunity to change that because I think it is the wrong approach to the problem.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. That is not a matter before us at this time. The gentleman should have made the change at the time the law was enacted.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON]?

There was no objection.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONTINUING THE COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION AS AN AGENCY OF THE UNITED STATES—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. SPENCE submitted the following conference report on the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 103) extending the life of the Commodity Credit Corporation:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 103) continuing the Commodity Credit Corporation as an agency of the United States, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows: That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the House amendment insert the following: "February 17, 1944"; and the House agree to the same.

BRENT SPENCE,
THOMAS F. FORD,
PAUL BROWN,
WRIGHT PATMAN,
CHARLES L. GIFFORD,
FRED L. CRAWFORD,

Managers on the part of the House.

ALLEN W. BARKLEY,
FRANCIS MALONEY,
GEORGE L. RADCLIFFE,
JOHN THOMAS,

Managers on the part of the Senate.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the conference report on Senate Joint Resolution 103, extending the life of the Commodity Credit Corporation.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I make a point of order a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 173]

| | | |
|------------------|-----------------|----------------|
| Allen, Ill. | Gavin | O'Brien, Ill. |
| Anderson, Calif. | Gerlach | O'Leary |
| Arnold | Gore | O'Toole |
| Baldwin, Md. | Grant, Ala. | Peterson, Ga. |
| Baldwin, N. Y. | Grant, Ind. | Pfeifer |
| Barden | Gregory | Philbin |
| Barry | Harris, Va. | Phillips |
| Beall | Hart | Pracht |
| Bender | Hartley | Randolph |
| Bland | Hebert | Reece, Tenn. |
| Boren | Heffernan | Reed, Ill. |
| Boykin | Hess | Rees, Kans. |
| Bradley, Mich. | Hill | Rizley |
| Bradley, Pa. | Holmes, Mass. | Rodgers, Pa. |
| Brooks | Jackson | Russell |
| Brumbaugh | Jeffrey | Sabath |
| Buckley | Jennings | Sasser |
| Burchill, N. Y. | Johnson | Satterfield |
| Busbey | J. Leroy | Scanlon |
| Byrne | Johnson | Schiffler |
| Cannon, Fla. | Lyndon B. | Schuetz |
| Capozzoli | Johnson, Ward | Schwabe |
| Celler | Jones | Scott |
| Chapman | Kee | Shafer |
| Chilperfield | Kelley | Sheridan |
| Cox | Kennedy | Sikes |
| Cullen | Keogh | Simpson, Pa. |
| Curley | Kilburn | Slaughter |
| D'Alesandro | Klein | Smith, Va. |
| Dawson | Knutson | Smith, W. Va. |
| Delaney | Landis | Snyder |
| Dickstein | Lane | Somers, N. Y. |
| Dies | Larcade | Starnes, Ala. |
| Dillweg | LeCompte | Stevenson |
| Dingell | Lynch | Sumner, Ill. |
| Domengeaux | McCord | Summers, Tex. |
| Douglas | McGehee | Tarver |
| Drewry | McKenzie | Taylor |
| Eaton | Maloney | Thomas, N. J. |
| Elmer | Manasco | Thomas, Tex. |
| Fay | Mansfield, Tex. | Tibbott |
| Feighan | Martin, Iowa | Towe |
| Fellows | Mason | Treadway |
| Fenton | May | Vursell |
| Fisher | Merritt | Wadsworth |
| Fitzpatrick | Miller, Pa. | Ward |
| Flannagan | Mills | Wasielewski |
| Fogarty | Morrison, La. | Weiss |
| Fulbright | Morrison, N. C. | Wene |
| Fuller | Mott | West |
| Fulmer | Mruk | Whelchel, Ga. |
| Furlong | Murphy | White |
| Gallagher | Myers | Wolfenden, Pa. |
| Gamble | Newsome | Wolverton |
| Gathings | Norton | Wright |
| Gavagan | | |

The SPEAKER. On this roll call, 26 Members have answered to their name a quorum.

On motion by Mr. COOPER, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SPENCE] that the conference report be considered at this time and the statement be read in lieu of the report?

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I understand that if objection is not made, the conference report will be brought up for immediate consideration, and that there will be hour debate on whether the conference report shall be adopted?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SPENCE] is entitled to an hour. He may yield to whom he desires in that time. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement as above set out.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. SPENCE. I yield.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Does the gentleman intend to yield 30 minutes of the time to me?

Mr. SPENCE. How much time does the gentleman want?

Mr. WOLCOTT. Thirty minutes, to be distributed by me as I desire. I have some requests for time on this side.

Mr. SPENCE. I understand that I have control of the time. I will be glad to yield to the gentlemen as they wish. I will be glad to yield to the gentleman from Michigan what time he desires to use himself.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I have some requests on the supposition that I would have time to yield.

Mr. SPENCE. I understand that is not customary; that I have control of the time. I am willing to yield to the gentleman whatever time he needs.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Will the gentleman yield 20 minutes to me personally?

Mr. SPENCE. Will that take care of those on your side?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I doubt it.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SPENCE] can yield as much as he pleases to the gentleman from Michigan and the gentleman from Michigan may yield as he feels disposed if there is no objection. If the gentleman has any proposition to make, the Chair will entertain it.

Mr. SPENCE. I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan and I ask unanimous consent that it may be controlled by him.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Why does not the gentleman divide the time equally as has been the custom? Why does not the gentleman yield 30 minutes to me?

Mr. SPENCE. I think that is fair enough. I do not know that we will want 30 minutes on this side.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to a request of the gentleman from Kentucky that in yielding the gentleman from Michigan 30 minutes, the gentleman from Michigan may be allowed to yield it as he sees fit?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SPENCE] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, this conference report involves simply a continuing resolution, continuing the life of the Commodity Credit Corporation. The Senate resolution provided that the Commodity Credit Corporation should continue until February 29, 1944. The amendment passed in the House provided that it should continue until February 5, 1944. We have been in conference this morning and the Members on behalf of the other body stated the question was one that should be decided by them; that the bill in reference to the Commodity Credit Corporation which has been so vigorously debated, was under their consideration, and they needed time to complete the consideration. They insisted on the original resolution, that the life of the Commodity Credit Corporation should be continued until February 29, 1944, in order to give them time to satisfactorily dispose of the problem. We insisted on the amend-

ment of the House. We refused to accept their date. In a spirit of compromise we split the difference and made it February 17, the date for the continuation of the life of the Commodity Credit Corporation. I think that was a fair disposition of the matter.

It is a matter that certainly is not of great importance. Twelve days' continuation of the life of the Commodity Credit Corporation, which gives it no additional powers, which does not change the dotting of an "i" or the crossing of a "t" of existing law. That is the question that is submitted to you. I think it needless to say more.

I reserve the balance of my time, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, there can be no compromise of this nature on this subsidy issue. The House voted overwhelmingly by a majority of 160 to prohibit the payment of consumer subsidies. There is no reason why the other body of the Congress should not have been considering this issue since last October. A bill was introduced in the other body at the same time a bill was introduced in the House. They were companion bills. It has been the strategy of those who were in favor of consumer subsidies to delay the enactment of this legislation just as long as possible. I warned the House, as did many others, as late as last October, when the bill was reported from the Committee on Banking and Currency in the House, that it was the strategy of those in favor of the payment of consumer subsidies to delay this just as long as possible, and particularly to delay it so that we would be pressured up against the Christmas recess, in order that we might do just as we did last July, pass a simple continuing resolution without a prohibition against the payment of subsidies.

Now, Mr. Speaker, you may yield to that strategy if you care to. I will not be a party to it. I did not sign the conference report.

A few days ago, when it became apparent that the other body probably could not get a quorum to consider the bill, although hearings on the bill had been concluded in the Senate, we were confronted with the condition. We said that because of this condition, because both branches of the Congress were desirous of recessing over the Christmas holiday, we would give the other body of the Congress 30 days in which to bring this up. That was a concession to a condition which existed in the Congress. They were told at that time that if they sought to continue the Commodity Credit Corporation without a prohibition against the payment of subsidies for 60 days, that that would be considered by the country and by the House, as a concession to those who favored the payment of subsidies. I believe that the other body of the Congress deliberately made this 60 days, knowing the attitude of the House, in the belief that they would split the difference and get as much time as possible to continue the payment of subsidies.

The payment of these subsidies is costing the taxpayers over \$100,000,000 a month. This matter has got to be settled as expeditiously as possible. At the present moment, the War Food Administrator gives as his reason for not announcing food programs, the fact that there is so much confusion in respect to this legislation. The War Food Administrator therefore wants this disposed of as quickly as possible. Who wants it continued? Those who are in favor of the payment of subsidies, and this is the strategy which they have been formulating since at least the 14th of last October, when this bill was reported out of the Committee on Banking and Currency in the House.

There is no reason under God's heaven why the other body of Congress should not have been considering their own bill for the last 3 months. They did not consider the House bill before the committee. They considered the Senate bill. They refused to report the Senate bill out by a vote of 9 to 8.

Now, it is our responsibility. Because of the confusion on this issue, because of the gross exaggerations which are made in respect to this issue, because of the intellectual dishonesty which is apparent with respect to this issue, because of the fact that, if we adopt this conference report, it will be hailed on the radio and in the press as a great victory for those who are in favor of the payment of subsidies, this conference report should be voted down decidedly.

It is the responsibility of the other body to act expeditiously in this matter. We have seen that other body act on major legislation with less than 5 minutes' debate. The gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SPENCE] on yesterday called attention to the fact that there was no opposition to the 60 days' continuance of the Commodity Credit Corporation, because there has not been any debate in the Senate. They did not debate this issue. Now, by voting down this conference report, we at least compel the other body of the Congress to give the same consideration to this problem that you and I have been giving to it since last June.

What happens to the Commodity Credit Corporation if we vote down the conference report and the Senate does not act? The same thing which happened last June and July when they forced us into exactly this same situation.

The resolution continuing the Commodity Credit Corporation after June 30 of last year did not become law until July 16, 1943, when the President signed Public Law 151; and the same thing might happen to Commodity Credit Corporation again. So it is not absolutely essential that we vote this resolution today to continue the Commodity Credit Corporation. This matter will be disposed of within a reasonable time after we reconvene, and no more danger to the life of the Commodity Credit Corporation will result from a failure to act on this than resulted last July when for 16 days the Commodity Credit Corporation was without legal life. Every lawyer in this House knows, of course, that

they can continue their present commitments during the so-called liquidation period and that any legislation following that can be retroactive to pick up the life of that Corporation as of December 31, 1943. They cannot, however, if no resolution is passed, continue to make commitments and I do not think a majority of this House wants them to make further commitments.

It has been said here that they have agreed that they would make no new commitments on consumer subsidies, and thus we are not doing anything by defeating this legislation than they have promised Congress that they would not do. In the meantime, pressure groups are at work on this legislation and every Member knows they are, and the longer this continues the more and the greater pressure will be brought.

In a letter of December 8, of which I have a copy before me, Chester Bowles, Administrator of O. P. A., had this to say:

Of course there are arguments against subsidies the validity of which I recognize. They will add to the tax burden and increase the national debt. They introduce new principles into American economy which have never before been experienced.

It should be decided definitely and as expeditiously as possible whether this Congress wants to adopt as a philosophy of government these new principles to which Mr. Bowles refers. He goes on to say:

There will be an immediate rise in the cost of living by an amount of 20 to 25 percent greater than the amount now being expended in subsidies.

I want to call attention to the fact that he stated the increase would be \$1,000,000,000, not the \$8,000,000,000 Mr. Bowles said in his statement to the press 2 weeks before that. That is what I mean by gross exaggeration. Mr. Bowles at one time for the purpose of getting votes for consumer subsidies said that it would increase the cost of living \$8,000,000,000, but in a letter written under date of December 8 he stated it would increase the cost of living by not to exceed 25 percent more than the amount now being expended in subsidies. The amount now being expended in subsidies is at the most \$800,000,000. It was 25 percent of that that he had reference to, so you have \$1,000,000,000 in consumer subsidies, but that means that \$3,000,000,000 must be raised by the people in taxes to pay it off. Mr. Bowles' argument was that the increase would set in motion a new wave of wage demands many of which doubtless would have to be satisfied.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 additional minutes.

If you take the amount that is being paid in subsidies annually and divide it by the population you will come to the conclusion that it amounts to 2 cents a day per capita. For a family of five that is the price of one glass of beer for the head of that family a day. I believe it is an insult to the patriotism of every wage earner in this country for Mr. Bowles to say that labor is going to strike,

labor is going to tie up war production merely because they have to curtail their beer consumption by one glass a day. How ridiculous that is. But this whole program is in such a position today that we cannot justify a continuance beyond the 30-day period. When the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KLEBERG] suggested February 5 I said that of course we would not quibble over a few days; whether it is the 1st of February or the 5th is not material, but any concession beyond the 5th of February is a decided yielding to the subsidy group and the groups which are pressing every one of us and the administration to continue this program just as long as possible without a prohibition against the payment of producer subsidies.

Mr. Speaker, you may do as you please; you may run up the hill and run down the hill just as much as you want, but this to me is a matter of principle and so long as I have any part of the responsibility for the formulation of Government principles and policies I am going to stand up and fight for those which I consider to be sound so long as there is a breath of life in my body to do so.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLMER].

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I have a very high regard for the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT], who has just addressed the House. I am sure his ability is acknowledged by almost everyone on both sides. The gentleman, I am afraid, is not living up to the high reputation and standard he has set here that has gained for him an almost universal feeling of respect and caused him to have this high standing in the House. He says he is fighting for principles. I can appreciate when a man has worked as hard as he against subsidies how he might be inclined to become—well, for want of a better word, "captious"—and yet if it is wrong to extend it for 60 days it is wrong to extend it for 1 day.

Now, what are we talking about? About the difference between tweedledee and tweedledum. What is a difference of 10, 11, or 12 days? If we are going to extend this thing why be captious about it? What difference does it make whether we extend it for a few more days? The gentleman is familiar with the legislative status here; he is familiar with the fact that this would upset the whole appellation over the mere question of an extension of a few days. I have a very high regard for the gentleman; I feel just as he does about this House upholding its part of the dignity of this Congress, but at the same time we have had a meeting of minds; one side has given and the other has taken; one side has taken and the other has given. This certainly is a thing that we can all get together on and I hope the gentleman will not press his point.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON].

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, I spoke against consumer subsidies. I voted for the Steagall bill that passed the House, but in doing so I offered an amendment to clarify, as I understood the situation, the language of the bill which I thought prohibited the payment of producer subsidies, such as the beet-sugar subsidy. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT] assured me that I was wrong. I had a very limited time to present the amendment. It was overwhelmingly voted down.

There are still those who do not think that the bill as passed by the House will permit the continuation of that program. I do not believe anybody in this House is opposed to it.

I agree with the gentleman from Mississippi that the compromise agreed upon, by our conferees to give 12 more days is not a compromise of principle. These are critical days. Next year I believe be the most critical year we shall see, and the thing that makes it critical is a spirit of discontent, a spirit of bull-headed obstinacy, a group movement that "I must have what I demand and will make no concessions to the viewpoint of the other fellow." We did a fine job in this House yesterday; there was unity of purpose and action. I would hate to see that record marred now just before we are going home to celebrate the anniversary of the birth of the Prince of Peace. The Senate has made a concession to us; they ask us to make a concession to them of 12 days only. We do not agree to go back on anything that we have previously stood for; we merely agree in a spirit of sweet reasonableness to meet the viewpoint of the other fellow just a little way, just 12 days. I frankly do not see how we can do any less. We must not go home and let the Commodity Credit Corporation die.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, how does the time stand?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Michigan has 16 minutes remaining, the gentleman from Kentucky 22.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GIFFORD].

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I am standing beside a man for whom I have great affection, and even more that affection. I have great admiration for his great and unquestioned ability. I am sorry to see him now rather dissatisfied with what we did in the conference today. I thought I was emphatic enough yesterday and that we voted the way he must have appreciated in his absence. I must confess that when we met the Senate in conference this morning and they told us they probably would not return from the recess until January 10, and that they really needed a little time beyond the 5th of February, I thought it fair to yield halfway. They wanted 20 additional days; however, we finally induced them to reconsider. I did not think that in doing that I was working against the wishes of my friend from Michigan. Under the circumstances I have outlined, we tried to act fairly for the House. We are not now discussing

the principle. The gentleman from Michigan cannot be less yielding on this question of the principle of subsidies. I still fear the result of the threat and the shaking the plum tree and the votes that might be changed. That was my speech on yesterday; that was the whole issue, it is the issue here today. I should like to add that what worries me a little; as the gentleman from Michigan suggests, is the way the newspapers pan us—and do they pan us! They pan us because we do not stand up in our shoes and stop taking dictation from the White House. Then when we try to stand up in our shoes and vote our sincere beliefs, think what happens to us at the hands of the press as illustrated in this subsidy matter. We cannot suit the press. It is their method and joy to criticize more often than to commend. It is news when they criticize. This House has carefully weighed this matter of subsidies. We in the House have declared for an antisubsidy bill. As usual, the press largely takes the other side. It may be best to run down the hill a short ways, and I may have run up the hill pretty far yesterday. I can retreat a little when necessary and strengthen my position.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GIFFORD. I yield.

Mr. COOPER. Would it be fair to inquire of the gentleman from Massachusetts if this conference report is signed by all of the conferees who were present at the conference?

Mr. GIFFORD. I do not like to have the gentleman put it that way. I think all signed it except the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. COOPER. Was the gentleman from Michigan present at the conference?

Mr. GIFFORD. He was there when I left.

Mr. Speaker, I want to say in closing that we are very proud of this man from Michigan. Just because I cannot follow him everywhere he goes, especially when he does not tell me where he wants to go, should not alarm him; but as I have before said to him and now repeat, How can I play second fiddle well when to me he will not tell? But I want him to know I am supporting him loyally on principle of the antisubsidy legislation. His personality and good judgment will continue to guide me. I do think highly of him. But in this case, I thought he might prepare to follow me.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BROWN].

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, the merits of the Commodity Credit Corporation bill are not in question in this resolution. It is simply extending the life of the Commodity Credit Corporation, which has done more for the American farmers than all of the other agencies of Government combined. The Corporation has been in existence now for 10 years. I remember in 1933 when corn and wheat were selling for 25 and 35 cents per bushel; when cotton was selling for 6½ cents per pound, the Commodity Credit Corporation was set up for

the purpose of stabilizing the prices of agricultural products and made loans to the farmers in order for them to carry their surplus crops until they could sell them in an orderly way. So the question here is extending for a limited time the life of the Commodity Credit Corporation, which expires December 31 this year.

I am against certain types of subsidies; subsidies to roll back the prices to consumers are unsound. I am for support prices and incentive payments in order to produce more war crops. The Commodity Credit Corporation bill which passed the House a few weeks ago did not change the benefits under the A. A. A. Act or the soil-conservation benefits. If we have to pay subsidies to consumers of this country when everybody has a job for the first time in a quarter of a century, what will we do when 25,000,000 or 30,000,000 people employed in making implements of war and 15,000,000 in the armed services of this country come back without jobs?

Mr. Speaker, we are not deciding that principle today. We conferees met this morning. We might not have a quorum on Monday. We must extend the life of the Commodity Credit Corporation. As your representatives, we did the best we could. The Senate wanted to extend the life of the Corporation until the 29th day of February. I voted yesterday to extend its life until the 5th day of February. The best we conferees could do was to split the difference, and we agreed on the 17th of February. We have done the very best we could, and it is important that we vote now to sustain the conferees in order to extend the life of the corporation that has done so much for the American farmer. If not, on January 1 we will be without the Commodity Credit Corporation.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KLEBERG].

Mr. KLEBERG. Mr. Speaker, at the outset, though I belong to a different party from my distinguished friend, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT], I am going to stand right square shoulder to shoulder with him on the matter of refusing to believe that the conference report coming back with an added extension of 12 days is a mere source of quibbling. I join him as a Member of this House in that it is a matter of principle, it is not a matter of quibbling. This is the first time since I have been a Member of this body that I have ever felt myself so moved as to say that even though a long vacation means as much to me as it does to any Member of this House, possibly more, and that as an individual for private reasons I have more reasons for wanting to be home than most of those who are anxious to go home, still I cannot believe that the public confidence of this Nation will be aided and strengthened by the House of Representatives coming to an agreement purely because of the argument that we are quibbling over a few days. It is more than that.

Mr. Speaker, the farmers of the South of this great Nation and in the far

West, the great State of California, have a right to know, in view of the fact the planting season is already upon them, as soon as possible just what is going to happen to this program. This Nation is entitled to the utmost in food production and, to use the Speaker's own words, in unity to both produce and fight more than it has ever done in its history. Surely the matter of settling the issue between the Houses, if there is any quibbling over time it is set aside in view of the fact that an expenditure of billions of dollars was passed in the other body without going into the facts involved and the merits of the case in approximately 5 minutes, in the 35 days under the House amendment they cannot claim they will not have enough time.

No, Mr. Speaker, it is a matter of putting before this country the fact that certain people are trying to saddle a gigantic octopus on this Nation which would sap the very virtue of its people, a virtue upon which its continuity depends, and which will sap the foundations from our American way of life that men and women both are dying to preserve. If this House is in too big a hurry to get home for vacation with conditions like that facing it, I will not stand up and argue that it is a matter of quibbling among friends over time. There is a grave difference of opinion between me and those gentlemen who consider this matter to be of such trivial significance that they would be willing to trifle with the intelligence of the American people further, and at the same time undermine their confidence in the one branch of Government which stands and should stand eternally vigilant over the price of liberty, and I refer to the Congress of the United States. It would be a sad thing indeed, if the decision were reached this afternoon because of the haste of Members in their desire to go home, to settle this matter and agree upon the little item of 12 days as being of such great importance that we have to do it upon that basis, yielding to the power of propaganda and publicity which we know so well will be used in this case, and at the same time further fixing this monster, this festering cancer already begun, still further upon the American people.

Mr. Speaker, if I vote alone in this case, I will vote the conference report down, and not up on the matter of the so-called adjustment based on 12 days, and take my chances in the forum of American reason on the issue.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK].

Mr. MCCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I hardly think it is fair for my distinguished friend, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KLEBERG] to try to leave the impression that the Members of the House are taking this action just to go home. I hardly think any fair-minded person in any man's district has not already recognized the fact that Members of Congress like to be home on Christmas Day the same as they do. But this is not for the purpose of going home.

We are nearing the close of a session. This session will be over on January 3.

The other body passed a resolution providing for 60 days. We passed it providing for February 5—35 days. In the orderly legislative processes in conference the matter is adjusted, which is done on many, many occasions and on every bill where there is a disagreement between both branches of the Congress. From the farmer's angle, the extension is vitally important. Unless we do something by December 31 the Commodity Credit Corporation expires. Subsidies may continue thereafter under the R. F. C. So it is not a question of stopping subsidies. We know that between now and December 31 the chances of final action being taken in the present legislative set-up are remote so far as continuation of the Commodity Credit Corporation Act is concerned. So that this very action and extension is of vital concern to the farmers of the country.

There is no controversy about the extension, no matter how we feel on subsidies; but if the act is not extended there is danger. Suppose the Senate did not act, or suppose it did and the bill was vetoed and the veto did not come until after January 3. The Commodity Credit Corporation Act has expired. Certainly none of us want that to happen. So the extension of the matter 12 days or 15 days, or whatever the adjustment between the two branches may be, is a minor matter and certainly should not be termed quibbling, but is a practical way of meeting a practical question confronting us.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE].

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, a great deal has been said about the fact that we should adopt this conference report in a spirit of compromise. I was under the impression that on yesterday when the House agreed to the date of February 5 it represented a compromise. We all know that there was not any fight made in the House as to the adoption of that date, February 5. I think it was the general understanding of those who voted for that date that it did represent a compromise and that the Senate would probably agree to accept the date the House agreed upon. I am very sure if there had not been that impression prevalent there would have been a fight here in the House upon that resolution when it came before us yesterday.

Mr. Speaker, a good deal has been said about the difference 12 days might make. Twelve days at this particular time of the year, when farmers are outlining their programs for planting and sowing during the coming year, mean a great deal. We are all aware of the fact that Marvin Jones has twice stated publicly that it is imperative we pass this legislation now before we recess for the holidays; that is, that we pass legislation extending the life of the Commodity Credit Corporation and settling the question of subsidies, because until we do that the Food Administrator is absolutely unable to tell the farmers of the

country what kind of a program they will have next year. The farmers cannot make their plans and proceed with their operations until they know what that program is going to be. So far as I am concerned, I dislike very much to see this thing go over even until February 5, because it is going to seriously interfere with our food program next year. Twelve days can make a great deal of difference, 1 or 2 days might make a great deal of difference, and I think in all fairness to the Food Administrator we ought to insist that this question of subsidies be settled at the earliest possible date. The thing to do is to vote down this report and insist on the House's position.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WORLEY].

Mr. WORLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that upon completion of the pending business I may be permitted to proceed for 10 minutes to explain the provisions of the soldiers' vote bill which I have introduced today.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WORLEY]?

There was no objection.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. RAMSPECK].

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, like the gentleman from Mississippi, I, too, have great admiration for the gentleman from Michigan. I think we all do, but we are not discussing the merits of subsidies or the demerits. The only thing we are undertaking to do here is to carry out the Constitution of the United States. Our forefathers, in their wisdom, provided us with two branches of the legislative department and they said we had to agree on the identical language before anything became law. We followed the processes of the Constitution in this case and each House has conceded to the other an equal amount of the difference existing between them. So we have this conference report here and it is up to us whether we take it or reject it.

Suppose you reject it? Does that force the other body to consider the question of subsidies before the end of this session of the Congress? It does not. Does it insure the continuance of the Commodity Credit Corporation beyond December 31? It does not. You do not accomplish anything by rejecting this conference report unless you can force the other body to agree to your terms and they have already made as much concession in this matter as have the conferees on the part of the House. So it seems to me the part of wisdom and of common sense for us to adopt the conference report and come back here in the beginning of next session and undertake to settle this matter, which has so disturbed the Members of Congress and the people through the country. But we are not going to gain anything, in my judgment, by rejecting this conference report, except to upset further the people of this country who are dependent upon the operations of the Commodity

Credit Corporation, because it is entirely possible that if we reject this report the Commodity Credit Corporation will go out of business on December 31, and we will make a bad situation worse.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON].

Mr. CARLSON of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I cannot quite agree with the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. RAMSPECK] that a compromise should be made today. I think we made it yesterday. So far as I personally am concerned, we did make it. I was my intention to oppose any extension of time but I did agree to the date of February 5, upon the theory if that was the best we could do we would give the other body opportunity and time to work out a bill we could accept and adopt. I felt the need and urgency for immediate action. I feel it today. This Congress could and should have acted on this important measure before January 1. The country is going to hold us responsible for not so doing. We can talk about delaying it for just a matter of 12 days as though that were inconsequential. But remember that food is an essential and important item, not only for this Nation but for our allies. The farmers of this country must know what they are to do. It is all right to talk about it not making much difference, 12 days or 30 days, but it is most important when the next harvest season comes around to see that we have a food supply for people.

The farmers of our Nation are confronted with a labor shortage, a farm machinery shortage, and now you want to confuse and delay the planning of their farm programs. Any delay on this measure is inexcusable. Restrictions, red tape, regimentation have all hindered full production, and now we want to add confusion.

Those who favor this delay will and must be held accountable for any reduction in food production that results from uncertainty in securing early action on this legislation.

And that is what is at issue here today. That is one of the reasons why I do think we should vote down the conference report. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT] has taken a definite stand and I believe his stand is in the interest of our people.

Now something has been said about the extension of the Commodity Credit Corporation. I think it has been a most vital and effective agency for the agricultural sections of our Nation. But what happens if we do not extend it? What happened between July 1 and July 17? There was not any serious calamity. It will be taken care of as it has in the past. Therefore, I urge you this afternoon to support the position of the gentleman from Michigan.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS].

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, the only thing I feel is of vita

importance in this matter is to make certain there is no period of time during which the Commodity Credit Corporation cannot function at all. If that should happen, I want to testify that there are thousands upon thousands of dairy farmers in this country, and some of them in my section, who today are able to produce only because they are in receipt of subsidies to cover their cost of production, or a portion of it. If there is not any Commodity Credit Corporation, I do not know how those men are going to keep going. Of course, this issue should be settled at the earliest possible moment one way or another, but those producers of vital and necessary commodities have either got to have higher prices or they have got to have subsidies to cover their cost of production, and if there is not any Commodity Credit Corporation in existence, until this basic issue has been settled, I do not know what those men are going to do.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT].

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that the arguments advanced by the speakers of the majority party in trying to secure this additional extension of time in which to settle the subsidy question pretty well add themselves up to two simple contentions, one of which is, they contend there is no matter of principle involved, and the second one of which is that we ought to compromise with the Senate in proposing a delayed decision and meet them at some halfway point.

It is amazing to me that no speaker of the majority party except the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KLEBERG], who is supporting the position of the gentleman from Michigan, no other speaker on the Democratic side today said one single thing about the most important issue, that is, the vital question of getting food at this critical time in the Nation's history. Nobody speaking for this additional delay seems to have been concerned about the necessity of supplying food to our allies and for the soldiers and for the people on the home front. They simply limit their arguments to two points, one a matter of principle and the other a matter of compromise with the Senate. Let us consider the arguments. The principal argument of the gentlemen of the majority adds up to whether it is tweedledee or tweedledum, according to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLMER], only that and nothing more.

It seems to me, however, there is a greater principle than that involved, certainly, and that is the principle of whether or not the House is an integral part of this Congress and is going to respond to the demands of the people to settle this very significant problem of subsidies one way or the other at a very early date. The gentleman from Texas, Mr. Marvin Jones, our former colleague, has told us very candidly we are jeopardizing the entire food supply of this Nation if we continue to dilly-dally with this problem. No speaker of the majority side, as a matter of principle, has refuted that argument here this afternoon. An

additional delay of 2 or 3 weeks can have a tremendous effect in the maturing of crops. In my State that much time, for example, sometimes marks the difference between a bumper corn crop and a crop ruined by an early frost. We owe it to the farmers of America to settle this subsidy question, so that they can make the plans for their farm operations.

Now, as a matter of compromise, the Democratic speakers say, let us meet the Senate halfway. If we meet the Senate halfway on this conference report, this extension of time should go no further than January 31, because the House by its emphatic action a month ago said that subsidies should be abandoned after December 31. If we are going to compromise on a 50-50 basis, halfway to the time limit set by the 60-day extension would come in January, not on February 5. Yesterday I voted against it—an extension even to February 5. I think the subsidy question should be settled before the first of the year. However, on yesterday the House decided to extend the time to February 5 to meet Senate requests, and now they come back asking for additional delay.

The big difficulty with New Dealers, Mr. Speaker, is that when they get into a situation involving mathematics, they get confused and bewildered. They cannot even recognize what 50-50 is. They do not know what a 50-50 basis is. First of all they give in to the Senate 50 percent, and then they divide the remainder 50-50 again, leaving the House one-fourth as a matter of practical application. I think that now is the time for us to take action in this question and that if a delay is to be authorized, it should certainly not defer the decision beyond February 5 at the most.

Mr. Speaker, the relentless march of the seasons goes on whether Congress meets or not and whether it acts when it does meet or simply adds up apologies for delay. Those who produce the foods and fabrics of America are entitled to know what the ultimate decision on subsidies is to be so they can plan accordingly. We must either stand by our guns, make an about-face, or accept some compromise solution. Whatever we do, it should be done soon so that the uncertainty can be ended and plans developed to make 1944 the greatest farm-production year in American history.

I might say, Mr. Speaker, that it was precisely because we suspected that some such "squeeze play" as that now confronting us would be resorted to in order to defer and delay the decision on subsidies that a number of us late in October organized the drive-for-action committee to stop the procrastination and speed up the decision. At least partially as a result of this committee's insistence, the House met the issue clearly and candidly last month and took emphatic action on the subsidy question. Now the whole decision languishes over in another body of this Congress. I presume there is nothing the drive-for-action committee can do to inspire action in that other body, but today we shall vote to reject this conference report and to oppose granting still additional delay beyond February 5 in deciding this im-

portant issue. I hope that sufficient Members of the majority party will join with us so that the conference report will be rejected. If it is, I feel confident the Senate will accept February 5 as the new deadline and that it will meet it. The Commodity Credit Corporation will continue to function in either case—the issue is simply and clearly one of devoting ourselves to the subsidy problem until it is finally and decisively decided for once and for all, so that we can get on with the job of producing the maximum from the farms of this Republic.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD].

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, we have about a five-way split on this proposition. If I should say what I would think about the two bodies of Congress, provided I thought either body or both of them would defer the 1944 food program for the mere purpose of going home to see their families, and mine has not been in this city for 2½ years, I say if I should say what I thought about that, provided I believed such a thing, it would be against the rules of the House to put it in the Record. So I will skip that part of it.

Mr. Jones has indicated that he cannot announce the 1944 food program because the 1944 food program has become involved in the Federal Treasury's activities, until we do something about the subsidies and about the Commodity Credit Corporation. So I do not believe that either House of Congress would stultify itself in delaying a program or a law beyond February 5 or beyond January 21 or beyond February 17, provided the two bodies can reach an agreement first as between their own Members and then as between themselves before that date. So extending the life of the Commodity Credit Corporation, which is what we are talking about here, until February 17, does not say to me that Congress will take until February 17 to reach a decision. And if it does not take until February 17 to reach a decision, you will get action before that date. If Congress decides by a roll call or otherwise to defer further action until February 17 that is a decision for Congress. When Congress makes that decision I will stand on it regardless of the political consequences. There are some things I do not propose to do now or later, and that is to die a political death every time I have to vote on a roll call. I am just not so constituted and I do not lose any sleep over those things.

You can take that for what it is worth. Yesterday I questioned the extension to February 5, because of what Mr. Jones said, as the Record will show. I will give the other man credit for having just as much interest in the 1944 food program as I have, so we will leave that as it is.

Now here is another proposition. I was informed by the leader of the other body this morning that the Commodity Credit Corporation and the administration had agreed not to initiate any new subsidy program until Congress acts on

this proposition. That covers the five-way split that I mentioned when I first began to talk. I signed the conference report.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I yield.

Mr. WHITE. Does the gentleman not think when Congress is supporting the administration program to control inflation and provide food for the country, as long as Congress has made the commitment and gone on record in support of this program we ought to continue through and support the administration in what they have undertaken?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I cannot agree with the gentleman on that, because I am not supporting the administration in its subsidy inflation prevention program. I have voted against it before and I shall vote against it, as the gentleman from Texas said, if I am the only one, on a roll call, because I do not intend to vote for the subsidy program as a means of preventing inflation. The subsidy program as proposed will not prevent inflation. I signed the conference report to extend the life of the Commodity Credit Corporation to February 17. That is what the conference report deals with. Between now and that date and at the earliest moment possible the Congress and the President should deal with this question in full and give the country the answer.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. WOLCOTT) there were—ayes 134, noes 66.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Two hundred and twenty-eight Members are present, a quorum.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER [after counting]. Thirty-two Members have arisen; not a sufficient number.

The yeas and nays were refused.

So the conference report was agreed to. A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may address the House for 10 minutes following the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WORLEY].

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

CONTROLLING THE SALE OF SURPLUS WAR MATERIALS

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD at this point and to include therein a copy of a bill being introduced today at the request of the House Small Business Committee, on controlling the sale of surplus war materials.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?
There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, with the unanimous approval of the House Small Business Committee, today I am introducing a bill designed to control the sale of surplus war materials by the Government. The Select Committee on Small Business of the House is composed of the following Members: ROBINSON of Utah, KEOGH of New York, JACKSON of Washington, KEFAUVER of Florida, HALLECK of Maryland, LEONARD W. HALL of New York, PLOESER of Missouri, STEVENSON of Wisconsin, and myself, chairman.

This measure deals with one of the foremost problems now confronting the Nation. Surplus materials already are being disposed of by the Government, and it is estimated that the total value of such goods to be sold after peace will be approximately \$75,000,000,000. At present, goods are being sold by junior executives located in more than 100 field offices of the different branches of the Government. This is being done without any general policy and chiefly by authority of an Executive order. Doubt exists in many quarters as to the legality of these sales, but there is general agreement that Congress has an immediate duty to legislate an over-all sales program into law.

The House Small Business Committee bill is simple in its provisions and will, your committee believes, deal adequately with the situation without creating any extensive new bureaus or involving any great cost. Primarily, it would make use of existing Government personnel widely experienced in business and finance, aided by advisory committees from retail business groups.

The chief aims of the bill are to obtain the greatest possible return for the taxpayer from the sale of goods, to assist in providing employment for returning members of the armed forces and others, to secure an even flow of goods to those places which need them most, and to help reestablish retail businesses which are now suffering from a lack of goods. The bill seeks to discourage speculation in surplus goods and to prevent the indiscriminate dumping of Government property at junk prices.

Principal provisions of the measure are as follows:

A central committee composed of the chairman of the board of directors of the Defense Supplies Corporation, as chairman, and the Secretaries of War, Navy, and Treasury and three experienced businessmen to be chosen by the President, with the advice and consent of the Senate, shall assemble and declare for sale all Government-owned surplus goods.

An immediate inventory shall be made of all surplus goods, which shall be kept up to date through frequent revisions.

Actual sales of material shall be made under the direction of R. F. C., acting in cooperation with advisory committees chosen from the retail groups represented by the surplus goods in question in each instance. R. F. C. will be charged with responsibility for getting fair prices for goods and shall see to it that they are properly distributed so as to meet the needs of consumers. Goods are not to fall into the hands of speculators, but are

to be sold so as to help provide employment and to aid retail business in getting back on its feet. In outlining a general program for R. F. C. to follow, however, the measure does not bind the bureau with too many inflexible provisions. It is the thought of this committee that R. F. C., in cooperation with these business advisory committees with plenty of latitude for action and a sincere desire to solve the problem, can do the job effectively.

A primary reason for selecting R. F. C. as the selling agency is that it already is charged with responsibility for disposing of industrial plants in which the Government has investments. Thus, this measure would bring all war materials investments of the Government under one management.

The only new positions sought to be created by this bill are memberships on the central and advisory committees. They would carry only nominal per diem compensations.

In general, this bill meets the outstanding wishes of all groups in and out of government who have been seeking surplus war goods legislation. On the question of need for a central operating agency all are agreed. Secretary of Commerce Jones, Under Secretary Forrestal, Admiral Land, and Under Secretary Patterson, who will be responsible for the sale of a vast quantity of Army goods, have all endorsed such an agency in testifying before two congressional committees. All business groups who have expressed an opinion to this committee are for such an agency. Likewise there is universal agreement that a sales agency experienced in selling and distributing goods should be set up.

This requirement seems to be adequately met by R. F. C. That retail businessmen should be asked to contribute their best advice and counsel is recognized by all. Hence the provision for the advisory committees.

Approximately a dozen governmental groups today are endeavoring to find solutions of the surplus war-goods situation.

Director Byrnes, Bernard M. Baruch, the Bureau of the Budget, the Procurement Division of the Treasury, O. P. A., O. D. T., and certain branches of the Army and the Navy are all concerned about the situation and trying to contribute something to its solution.

A variety of sales plans are being offered. The Navy is selling its surplus directly to bidders. The Army is selling some goods direct and others are being turned over to Treasury Procurement. Officials of Treasury Procurement are having a hard time trying to evolve a satisfactory sales plan. For instance, they are getting trucks and cars for sale from the Army, but they have not yet arrived at a definite selling plan for these items. Some officials want to sell direct to the public. Dealers, who are virtually without trucks, are eager to buy the surplus, but first they are told they will not be permitted to bid on them and, later are told that they will have to compete against individual bidders. At first, O. D. T. planned on setting up a truck rationing plan, then this was aban-

[PUBLIC LAW 219—78TH CONGRESS]

[CHAPTER 383—1ST SESSION]

[S. J. Res. 103]

JOINT RESOLUTION

Continuing the Commodity Credit Corporation as an agency of the United States.

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the first sentence of section 7 of the Act approved January 31, 1935 (49 Stat. 4), as amended, is hereby amended by striking out "December 31, 1943" and inserting in lieu thereof "February 17, 1944".

Approved December 23, 1943.

